

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 1, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## THE SHARPLES SEPARATOR CO.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not wish to correct the RECORD, but I do desire to correct a mistake of fact which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] unwittingly fell into on Wednesday, when the Senator from Pennsylvania, joining in the wailing chorus of jeremiads sweeping over the Senate, among other things called attention to numerous cases of industrial depression and suspension of industrial enterprises. Among others was the Sharples Separator Co. I desire to read what the Senator said on that occasion with respect to the Sharples Separator Co. The Senator from Pennsylvania said:

One final case, and I am done—that of the Sharples cream separator concern, located about 30 miles from Philadelphia, in the city of West Chester. The Sharples cream separator is an invention of Mr. Sharples, on which he has built up a plant there employing many men and women and children. His goods, the cream separators, are shipped not only all over the United States but all over the world, to China and to the Orient. Within a week that concern has completed the absolute transfer of its plant to Hamburg, and no longer is there a vestige of it left in the State of Pennsylvania.

This morning I clipped from the Philadelphia Inquirer—

Mr. PENROSE. I saw it.

Mr. STONE. A communication from the Sharples Separator Co., by L. P. Sharples, one of its officials, and I will ask the Secretary to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

## SHARPLES SEPARATOR TO REMAIN.

To the Editor of the Inquirer:

Owing to the state of the weather everybody in our home office and main factory at West Chester woke up this morning wishing we were anywhere except on the job.

In consequence it was like kicking a man when he was down to find that your paper this morning quoted Senator PENROSE as having said on the floor of the Senate that we are bag and baggage in Germany. If it were not for the necessity of filling orders, the personnel of our organization would like to be.

We would appreciate being set straight in this regard, as there is no question but what Senator PENROSE has been misinformed.

The following states our position and may be used as your editorial sense dictates:

The information on which Senator PENROSE based his assertion in Congress, Wednesday, was absolutely incorrect. The Sharples Separator Co. has no intention of transferring any part of its American works to its Germany factory.

Regardless of the passage of a tariff bill, adverse to their interests, the Sharples works, their sales and service organizations will remain in full force in the United States. Sharples has been too long on American soil that it can move to any other and prepare to call it home.

Very truly, yours,

THE SHARPLES SEPARATOR CO.,  
L. P. SHARPLES.

WEST CHESTER, PA., July 31.

Mr. STONE. The other corporation referred to by the Senator has not yet been heard from; we have had no returns. I simply put in this one now.

Mr. PENROSE. I expected this to be brought up this morning, Mr. President, and I will have by Monday the full facts in connection with the Sharples Cream Separator Co. to submit to the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it does seem cruel that this should be perpetrated on the Senator from Pennsylvania at this particular time. But I do want to say, just in addition to the little I said regarding the Sharples separators, if the Sharples Co. are not only, according to the Senator's statement, furnishing separators for milk in the United States, but are shipping them all over the earth, to China and the Orient, my God, what more can they want in a tariff bill? Do they want to supply Mars and all the other planets? It seems to me they are pretty thoroughly established and work very nicely under the present régime, and they are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. PENROSE. As I said, Mr. President, I will have the precise facts in this case to submit to the Senate on Monday.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to say, in response to what the Senator said, that I think it would be very wise if all Senators on the other side would have the precise facts at hand before they put statements of that kind in the RECORD.

Mr. PENROSE. I only made a general statement, and if the Senator from Missouri wants details I shall be ready to furnish them to him next week, when I get them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Missouri is so broad as to include every reference to cases of this nature. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that the day the tariff bill came over here I made the statement that the Hoe Printing Press Co. were get-

ting their London office and factory in shape to manufacture presses there after the passage of this bill. I give as my authority for the statement the word of the president of the company, who told me so at his office in New York before I made the statement.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, would the Senator from Missouri object to modifying his suggestion so as to apply to all Members of the Senate, that they shall be certain that they have the facts before they proceed to state them? His suggestion was limited to one side. I see no objection, if the Senator sees none, to enlarging it to take in the entire Senate.

Mr. OLIVER. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

## TARIFF DUTY ON IVORY TUSKS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I present three petitions from workmen in ivory piano key factories, asking that ivory tusks be left upon the free list. They are from Pratt & Read & Co., 413 men; Comstock & Cheny & Co., 545 men; and the Piano & Organ Supply Co., 339 men; the total being 1,297 laborers in these factories.

I suppose, Mr. President, that ivory tusks, which have always been upon the free list, have been placed upon the dutiable list with a duty of 20 per cent on the theory that they are a luxury. I am informed that of the 375,000 pianos annually manufactured in the United States, 90 per cent of them go into the homes of mechanics and people of small means, and that this percentage is sold on the installment plan with average payments of less than \$5 a month. Later on amendments will be presented to restore that product to the free list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

## TARIFF DUTIES ON WOOL.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I desire to say in connection with the petition which I presented the other day that I have received a letter from the Hockanum Mills Co., of Rockville, Conn., a part of which I will ask the Secretary to read, and then I will make a few remarks upon it. There being no objection, the Secretary read as follows:

THE HOCKANUM MILLS CO.,  
Rockville, Conn., July 30, 1913.

HON. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am much pleased to see in the paper this morning that you have moved to have a date set for the going into effect of the free wool and the woolen goods duties.

We are now offering for sale goods for next summer and we are greatly embarrassed, because we do not know when we will get free wool nor when the goods duties go into effect.

We should have five or six months between free wool and the new goods duties, and that has been the custom in all former tariff legislation, I believe.

Our light-weight goods season for next summer begins, as I said, now, and deliveries of those goods should end next February or March.

All of the mills of the country, with very few exceptions, are running on less than 25 per cent production, as stated in Mr. Hill's letter to you, and if we can not get some positive dates fixed the mills are apt to be less employed than 25 per cent.

As I said before, we are all very much pleased that you have taken up this matter in such a positive way, and are in hopes that the powers that be can get together and enact some positive date so that the woolen mills can either do a little business or get out of business.

I am yours, sincerely,

F. T. MAXWELL, President.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In connection with the same matter I have a statement from the Trans-Atlantic Import Co., made by Mr. Harry Rosenbaum, which I will ask the Secretary to read. There being no objection, the Secretary read as follows:

TRANS-ATLANTIC IMPORT CO.,  
New York, July 30, 1913.

Senator BRANDEGEE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Have read with a great deal of pleasure in to-day's paper your suggestion of the passage of a joint resolution setting forth when the new rates on textiles would become effective.

I congratulate you on having grasped the situation and personally thank you, and you have the thanks of a great many other people engaged in the textile business to-day.

I inclose you herein copy of an interview published on the 19th of April, more than three months ago, setting forth your views exactly. If the Senate to-day were to appoint a committee to visit the cutting-up markets of New York, Cleveland, and Chicago and see the state of the textile industry, they would be simply amazed at the chaotic condition in which it exists.

Merchants as a rule have anticipated the tariff bill to be passed as early as July or August, and where the House states explicitly the bill to be effective immediately upon its passage, and the Senate report of the Finance Committee making Schedule K effective on January 1, 1914, has caused such an uncertainty in the trade that business in textiles of all descriptions is at an absolute standstill, and business conditions to-day, one thing reflecting upon another, are in a worse condition than they have ever been in any panic times we have had in this country for 20 years.

The credit of the cutter up of merchandise has been impaired owing to the uncertainty. The cutter up of merchandise will not accept his deliveries. The retail merchant and department-store buyer has been

instructed not to buy, expecting a revision at some time or other, prior to the sale season or before there will be any consumption. Manufacturers of textiles in this country have all curtailed their output. Importers of textiles have canceled the better part of their European contracts, and should the tariff bill take effect in the immediate future, the consumer will not be benefited in any way whatsoever, because there will be a scarcity, and the demand will come the moment the consumption starts and then it will be a question of supply and demand. If, as you suggest, a joint resolution were passed, stating the date, it would allay this panicky feeling, settle the uncertainty, people would go to work and make the best of the situation, and would anticipate the future.

The country has been reconciled, ever since Wilson's election, that we were to have a tariff revision. This has been discounted. We believe it to be inevitable, but if a date were set, you will pardon my English, "both the Senate and the House can chew the rag indefinitely," and people would go about their business.

Were I selfishly inclined, the tariff bill could not take effect too soon, but considering the best interests of the country as a whole, any date is better than the uncertainty.

I hope sincerely that your suggestion will be presented and that it will pass, and assure you in advance that you would receive the congratulations of many thousands of textile men throughout the United States.

Pardon this long discourse, and awaiting your reply, I am,  
Sincerely, yours,

H. ROSENBAUM.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary to read an interview published in the Commercial and Financial World of April 19, 1913, on this same question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Commercial and Financial World of Apr. 19, 1913.]

A matter in regard to which there is the greatest criticism is the fact that no date has been set for the taking effect of the new bill. A few months earlier or later will make all the difference in the world to importers and domestic manufacturers, and it is no more than right and fair that they should know just what they have to face.

Mr. Harry Rosenbaum, of the Trans-Atlantic Import Co., of 105 Fifth Avenue, has pointed out this feature of the situation in a very clear and convincing fashion. He says:

"Unless importers and domestic manufacturers are advised promptly when this bill is to go into effect, business will be stagnant until we receive this vitally important information. Were I obsessed of selfishness I would say the sooner the bill became operative the better for ourselves. But considering the best interests of the country as a whole, we favor January 1 next, which will give merchants ample time to adjust themselves to the new state of affairs. Enactment without plenty of time for preparation would be ruinous to many small merchants."

And it is not only the importers who need to know the date as to when the bill is to become law. Manufacturers of domestic goods say that millions of dollars' worth of orders and raw material of great value stand in danger of being greatly injured unless definite time is fixed.

It is proposed to call the attention of Congress to this omission through trade associations and other commercial bodies. It is stated by handlers of domestic and foreign goods that heavy losses will have to be taken in the shape of a smaller business and the liquidation of stocks in the hands of all distributors unless a date is fixed at once.

Buyers are requesting that no goods be shipped until something definite is known regarding when the new rates are to go into effect, and this was one of the primary reasons why factors who cater to the cutting-up trade began to bestir themselves. Another phase of the business was that many purchasers advised mill agents they would make commitments for immediate requirements only and that they were beginning already to adjust themselves to the conditions they anticipated would arise in the near future.

Mr. Rosenbaum also calls attention to the fact that the duty on pile fabrics in the new tariff will be 50 per cent ad valorem, while the duty on the same fabrics made into garments on the other side and imported as finished garments will be only 35 per cent, which is not sufficient duty to protect the large American cloak industry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a few days ago, when I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the chairman of the Finance Committee, was kind enough to say that he would confer with members of the Ways and Means Committee of the other House and see if some date could be fixed upon by them, with a view of notifying the interests concerned as to when the new tariff duties would go into effect. I noted in one of the morning newspapers that some such conferences had been held, but that they had "borne no fruit," in the language of the newspaper. I now ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance if he is ready to make any statement to the Senate as to the result of his interviews or conferences upon this subject?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, what the manufacturers of wool seem to desire is that before we pass a tariff bill we shall make provision outside of the bill for the wool industry. I have stated that I recognized some embarrassment would come to that industry from the conflict between the provisions of the House and the Senate bill with reference to the time when this schedule should go into effect and was willing to do what I could toward ascertaining whether that difference could be reasonably adjusted in advance of a meeting of the conference. I have conferred with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and I find that he does not feel authorized, in advance of the conference, to recede from the position of the other House, and I do not feel authorized, in advance of the meeting of the conference, to recede

from the position taken by the Finance Committee in the amendment proposed to the Senate. Of course, if the Senator from Connecticut desires to introduce any resolution on the subject, he is at liberty to do so, and it can take its course between the two Houses. It does not seem to me, however, Mr. President, speaking frankly about it, that there is any remedy for this situation except the speedy passage of the bill, and I hope we may have that.

I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut, Does he prefer the House provision to the Senate provision with reference to the time when this schedule shall go into effect?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have no fixed idea of my own about it, not being familiar with the technicalities of the woolen business. I can, however, see the force of the position of those who are interested in it.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will understand, if he will pardon me for a moment, that this postponement of the date was in the nature of a concession, which we thought was proper under the circumstances. Of course, if the concession brings about difficulties of more consequence than the advantages, the committee will be glad to have the views of Senators on the other side about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he thinks the House conferees will agree to the Senate amendment as to the time the rates take effect.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am utterly unable to answer the Senator with respect to that; I am not authorized to say whether they would or would not. I think probably the chairman of that committee feels the same delicacy in speaking in advance for the conferees of the House that I would feel in speaking in advance for the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I will frankly say to the Senator that I believe both the growers and the manufacturers of wool would prefer the provision reported by the Committee on Finance of the Senate to the House provision, but what they do want, if possible, is to know when the rates are to take effect. The lightweight season of the woolen-goods business is on; people have to place their orders—

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that.

Mr. SMOOT. And it is for that reason that some definite understanding, if it be possible, should be had. I do not say, however, that it is possible.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator see the difficulties about that?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; I do see the difficulties, and I am not complaining at all. I simply wanted to know if the Senator had any idea whether the House committee would agree to the Senate amendment, because, if they would, I think that at least an intimation could then be given to the purchasers of woolen goods that that would be the case.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can only say to the Senator that I have seen and heard of no disposition upon the part of the House to yield its position upon that question.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from North Carolina asked the Senator from Connecticut which of the two provisions, the Senate or the House provision, he preferred.

Mr. SIMMONS. I meant, of course, which one the woolen industry preferred. I did not mean to inquire as to the preference of an individual Senator, but I meant the woolen industry.

Mr. LIPPITT. I so understood, and I was simply going to say that, while I am not a woolen manufacturer any more than is the Senator from Connecticut, I do think there is very little doubt that the woolen manufacturers, as a rule, and the entire woolen trade, as a rule, would very much prefer the Senate provision. I also want to say that I think the situation in which the introduction of the Senate amendment has left this whole question is infinitely worse than though the Senate committee had taken no action at all, because I think the trade could take steps to accommodate itself as well as might be to either course if they knew which course was going to be pursued.

Under the present condition two very different courses have been suggested; and the situation is left in the position where there is no man in the woolen trade who knows whether the provisions of this bill affecting wool are to go into effect at one date or the other. While I believe the members of the Finance Committee of the Senate in adopting this amendment did so with a view to helping the woolen manufacturer, it seems to



me that it was most unfortunate that in proposing such a change they did not first get some idea as to whether or not their suggestion would meet with favor at the other end of this building.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island, but if I have a right to yield to more than one Senator at the same time I yield cheerfully to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. I merely want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island, in connection with his suggestion that the action of the Senate committee in extending the time when this bill was to take effect would do the woolen industry greater injury than to have readily agreed to the House provision, that many representatives of the woolen industry appeared before our committee and requested this amendment. Certainly they knew that we were merely a coordinate branch of the Government, and that our action was not a finality as to what would be the law; that the House had to be considered; but they very urgently requested the Senate to extend the time as of vital importance to them.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, what the Senator says in regard to the woolen manufacturers knowing the condition in regard to the two Houses agreeing is perfectly true. They ought to have known that; but, as a plain matter of fact, very few of them thoroughly realize that very feature in the passage of a bill. They are not technically informed in that respect. What they came down here to urge—and did urge, I believe, very strenuously—was that there should be a fixed, definite date in advance of the final passage of this bill upon which the duty on wool should go into effect, and another date, subsequent to that date by three or four months, as the case might be, upon which it should go into effect upon the manufactures of wool. They hoped, if such a provision were put into this bill in the form of an amendment, that it would be with the idea that it should be the final policy of those who are responsible for the bill.

If it is simply put in the bill with the strong probability that when the bill actually becomes a law the policy of the House of Representatives will prevail, or even with uncertainty as to which policy is going to prevail, almost anybody, no matter how little technical he is, can readily see the confusion of mind into which every merchant and manufacturer connected with the business is put. I think that is perfectly plain.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina will permit me, while as an ordinary proposition some of these small manufacturers would not be familiar with the technicalities of legislation, yet I do recall that Mr. Whitman, if I am not very much mistaken, made an argument before our committee in which he cited the Wilson bill as extending the time and as a precedent that we ought to follow. Certainly Mr. Whitman understood, as I have no doubt the Senator will agree, that the Senate committee could only recommend this action to the Senate, and, of course, that would not be binding upon the House.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not want to take too much of the time of the Senator from Connecticut, but I want to say that we all know how legislation is accomplished. We all know that people who are prominent in the councils of a party, as the chairman of the Finance Committee is prominent and as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House is prominent, can agree on such a thing as this or can have some harmony of view upon it. All that was necessary to have had this matter definitely understood, with a strong probability of the final result, was that before any change in the policy was suggested in this body it should be known that in a general way the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee sympathized with that view. Simply to suggest here a policy opposed to the policy of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee adds no beneficial effect to the situation, but, on the contrary, as I am trying to explain, increases the confusion manifold.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I trust the Senator understands that in making amendments to this bill the Senate committee did not consider whether or not the House was going to agree to the amendments and desist from making them because it did not know what might be the final attitude of the House with reference to the amendments. We, of course, made the amendments that have been made upon our judgment.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am sure the Senator from North Carolina will not deny that it would have relieved this confusion very greatly if the situation I have tried to describe, of a harmony

of opinion between the two branches, had been arrived at before some different policy had been suggested.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the situation we have now was not anticipated; and if it had been anticipated I suppose Senators would have felt a delicacy in going over to the House and inquiring of the House Ways and Means Committee whether they would agree to an amendment if we made it.

I have said all I can say about the matter, and that is that I have seen no disposition on the part of the House committee to indicate any purpose to recede from its action. It might be well for us to consider what course we would pursue in that respect, in view of the fact that Senators state that rather than have this uncertainty it would be better to accept the House proposition. That is a matter about which I can express no opinion, but it is one that might be considered.

I want to say, in addition, before I finish, that there is one thing that might be done, and only one thing that I can see now; and so far as I am concerned I will do what I can to have that course pursued. When the conferees meet, in view of this situation, it can be arranged, I think, to take up this item in conference first, and try to reach some final conclusion about it; and in that way the final settlement of the matter might be advanced.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope such a course will be pursued.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I may.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to submit a couple of favorable reports in regard to routine matters from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I am sure the resolutions will pass without any question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no objection whatever, but I think it is in violation of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I ask unanimous consent to do it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I shall not raise the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask immediate consideration for the resolutions. I am sure there will be no objection. One of them is to give six months' pay to the widow of a dead employee and the other is to add to the pay of a clerk of one of the committees.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, personally I have no objection whatever to this matter being interpolated at this time. My impression is, however, that the rule provides that a Senator shall not be interrupted to present a matter of this sort, and that it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce the rule without his attention being called to it. I may be mistaken about that, but I will yield if I can.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am still waiting to get the consent of the Senator from Connecticut. I had no idea of presenting the reports without his consent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the Senator from Mississippi had heard me, he would have realized that I had given my consent three times, when once was enough.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then if the Senator—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I now give it for the fourth time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator has given his consent, then I ask immediate consideration for the resolutions. They will take only a minute. They are matters of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Mississippi tell the Chair how the Chair is to get out of enforcing the rule?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suppose anybody with intelligence can do anything by unanimous consent, Mr. President. I do not know. A man can do it; two men can do it; three men can do it; six men can do it; any organization I have ever heard of can do it. I have asked unanimous consent, and if unanimous consent is granted there is nothing in the way.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. All the Chair has to do is to put to the Senate the request for unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rules say that the Chair shall not do it. The Chair does not have much intelligence, but the Chair can read the rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is still the morning hour, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has the floor, and we have not yet reached reports of committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will wait until we do, then.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am very sorry the Senator could not get the matter attended to at this time.

The statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] that the Senate committee made this change in the date at the request of certain woolen interests seems to me to have no bearing upon this case. Admit that the Senate amendment is better than the House provision—

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator will pardon me, I did not state that we had made it at the instance or request of the woolen interests. I did state that they appeared and urged it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not mean to intimate that the committee was unduly under the influence of the woolen interests. Far from it. What I meant to say was that even if the Senate amendment was proposed by the committee after the woolen interests had suggested that it would be an improvement, it seems to have no relevancy to the present difficulty. The trouble is that the House has proposed one time and the Senate has proposed another.

After this matter has been called to the attention of the Finance Committee, and after everybody admits the embarrassment to this great trade in all its branches all over the country, for the Senator to say that if somebody else wants to introduce a resolution to try to smooth out this trouble there is no rule to prevent his doing so, and to prophesy that while it might be considered it probably would produce no remedy, is hardly the attitude that, it seems to me, the great Finance Committee of the Senate ought to take on this matter.

Here is a situation which imperils the whole woolen industry of this country. Authoritative documents have been put into the RECORD showing that the business is running on 25 per cent of its possibilities of production at the present time, and that there is a panicky feeling all through the business, from the production of the raw material to the sale of the manufactured product. To have the great Finance Committee of the Senate and the great Ways and Means Committee of the House stand here saying that they can not consider the remedy until the disease has proved fatal seems to me to be an admission of impotency that I exceedingly regret to discover in the Congress of the United States. The fact that after the bill gets into conference, at some indefinite date in the future, they may then take up this as one of the first matters to be considered in conference would have no tendency to calm the excited feeling in this trade which now exists. If the matter were taken up in conference as the first item, there is no assurance whatever that it would be reported independently and in advance of the entire conference report, if the conferees shall be able to agree.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with the desire expressed by the Senator from Connecticut that this time should be extended, certainly as long as provided in the Senate amendment; but I do not quite see, and I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he sees, any way in which the matter can be determined at the present moment. The House has passed the bill. It has been sent to the Senate, and the Senate proposes to amend it. However friendly the Finance Committee or the Senate itself may be to the Senate amendment, does the Senator think there is any method by which we can get assurance from the other body that they will agree to the Senate amendment?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. None except what I suggested the other day, which was that the Finance Committee of the Senate should report a joint resolution fixing the dates and send it over to the House of Representatives, and then let the House of Representatives act upon it, and, if necessary, appoint a conference committee upon the joint resolution if there is disagreeing action. That was the only way I could think of.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know whether there are precedents for that or not; but at first blush it strikes me that before a bill has been passed and before it goes to conference it would be rather extraordinary for us to pass a joint resolution of that kind.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It might be extraordinary.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, when the Senator had this matter up before I suggested to him that it would be not only an extraordinary thing but a very difficult thing to draw a resolution of that sort.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not anticipate any difficulty in drawing it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think when the Senator undertakes to do it he will find that there is difficulty.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not sure but that I shall undertake it, notwithstanding the warning of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have full knowledge of the fact that some of my own constituents are extremely solicitous about this matter, and if there is any remedy I hope we shall find it. But, as I look at the parliamentary situation, it seems to me the remedy is not visible to the naked eye, and that we shall find great difficulty in discovering it. That is my impression.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the difficulty which the Senator from Connecticut is seeking to obviate is the fact that the bill as it comes from the House provides that the duties shall go into effect immediately upon the passage of the bill and the Senate amendment provides that they shall go into effect on the 1st of January. As I understand, this change in the time when they shall go into effect is made at the request of the woolgrowers of the West.

Mr. SIMMONS. The woolgrowers of the West asked for it, yes; that is, through their representatives. I do not recall now that any woolgrower himself came, but the representatives of that section of the country asked for it.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Connecticut is not insisting upon a particular date, but upon a date?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; not only a date when the duty upon raw wool shall go into effect, but a date arranged with relation to that, in view of the seasonal nature of the trade, when the duties upon manufactured products of wool shall take effect; and that the two shall be arranged with proper reference to the time between the laying in of the raw material and the time when the manufacturers have to make contracts for the production of the manufactured article.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is not objecting particularly, then, to the fact that the bill provides at this time that it shall go into effect on the 1st of January?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; and of course my idea about which particular dates would be best for the trade is no better than that of any other Senator. In fact, other Senators' ideas are much better than mine, for they know more about the business.

I have said all I care to say about the matter this morning. I think in the near future I shall introduce a joint resolution which I hope will have the consideration of the Finance Committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. I venture the suggestion that if the Senator from Connecticut, using his persuasive methods, which we all understand, could induce the Senators on the other side who will be on the conference committee to stand out, not only a week or a month but as long as might be necessary, against the House conferees, and insist that this amendment should be agreed to, we would then have a practical solution of the matter.

If the bill shall be passed as it has come from the committee of the Senate, with this very desirable amendment, I hope the conferees on the part of the Senate will conceive it to be their duty to make a special contest to carry their point; because, laying aside all controversy about the duties on raw wool or manufactures of wool, there is no question that our manufacturing interests, at least—and I speak simply from a general knowledge—are very much disturbed over this particular phase of the proposed legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. I just want to add to what has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire that they may well be disturbed, for the reason that from the time the raw wool is taken into the mill, if its manufacture is immediately started, it is generally four months before it is made into cloth; and the manufacturers ought to have that difference so as to protect themselves in regard to the wool they have on hand.

#### PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present resolutions adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas relative to conditions in Mexico. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Senate of the United States is now engaged in debating a resolution offered by a distinguished United States Senator from the West concerning the policy that should be pursued by the Government of the United States in defense of the rights of its citizens in Mexico; and



Whereas American lives have been jeopardized and American property destroyed in Mexico by a persistent refusal of this Government to extend the proper protection to its citizens and their property in that country, when other foreign countries were protecting their citizens and their property rights by a firm attitude; and

Whereas a firm and dignified policy which recognizes and respects the rights of our neighboring Republic and demands in return respect of the rights of our citizens there would tend to preserve peace by promoting mutual respect; and

Whereas the national Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore on July 2, 1912, contains the following declaration of party faith, to wit:

"We pledge ourselves anew to preserve the sacred rights of American citizenship at home and abroad. The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property";

Now, therefore, be it  
Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of Texas that the Government of the United States should redeem and give meaning to the foregoing pledge of party faith in vindication of the national honor; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forthwith transmit this resolution by mail to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Texas.

The above resolution was this day adopted by the Senate of Texas.

W. V. HOWERTON,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from Texas permit me to make an inquiry? I should like to inquire of him whether his resolution was to be read?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I did not ask that it be read. If the Senator would like to hear it, it can be read. It is brief.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What was the reference?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CLAPP presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of the Civil Service Reform Association of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of Paragraph O, section 2, of the pending tariff bill, relating to the collection of the income tax, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I present sundry petitions signed by many estimable women of Delaware, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN), from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1673) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the county of Grant, State of Washington, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 94) thereon.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2576) for the relief of John Q. Adams, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 96) thereon.

#### SALARY OF ASSISTANT COMMITTEE CLERK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate Senate resolution 133, submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] July 15. I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, in line 5, before the words "per annum," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,800," and in line 6, before the words "to be paid," to strike out "\$560" and insert "\$360," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be authorized to employ one of his three assistant clerks, each now drawing a salary of \$1,440 per annum under the act of March 4, 1913, at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, the difference of \$360 to be paid from miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided by law.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SARAH W. PATRICK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I report back favorably with an amendment from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate Senate resolution 140, submitted by the

Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] July 21. I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was, after the name "Sarah," to insert "W.," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Sarah W. Patrick, widow of Lewis S. Patrick, late clerk to the Committee to Investigate Trespassers on Indian Lands, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the bill (H. R. 6383) to amend section 19 of an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, and I submit a report (No. 93) thereon.

I will state that the bill authorizes the advertisement and sale of the present post-office building and grounds in the city of Newark, N. J. Newark is the largest city in our State, having approximately a population of half a million. We have outgrown the present quarters. The bill proposes to grant authority to sell the present post-office building and grounds for a sum not less than \$1,800,000 and then to devote \$800,000 for the purchase of a site that shall be fitting and proper according to the department, and it provides further for the use of \$1,000,000 for the erection of a building. It is quite essential that the matter be taken in hand at once, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It will cost the Government nothing. There are no amendments to the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not wish to object to its consideration and I will not do so, with the understanding that if it leads to any debate the Senator will withdraw it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I certainly will acquiesce in that. There are no amendments and the bill is reported by the committee unanimously. I can see no reason for debate. If it should lead to debate, I certainly would withdraw it.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### PUBLIC LAND ENTRIES.

Mr. STERLING. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 2419) permitting male minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry on the public lands of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 95) thereon. The bill is accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, which I ask that the Secretary may read, with a view of asking unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. The letter of the Department of the Interior is as follows—

Mr. SIMMONS. Is it necessary to read that letter in connection with the report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota has asked that the letter be read to show the necessity for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes to the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 2870) to provide for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 2871) to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2872) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Conway; and

A bill (S. 2873) granting an increase of pension to David N. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2874) granting a pension to Catherine Kelly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### DUTIES ON COTTON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. LIPPITT. I submit a proposed amendment which I desire to offer to the tariff bill, and I should like to have it read and lie on the table.

The amendment was read, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Beginning on page 73, strike out paragraphs 255 to 271, inclusive. In lieu thereof insert the following:

"PAR. 255. From and after the day following the passage of this act, in lieu of the terms and provisions of Schedule I of the act of Congress approved August 5, 1909, the terms and provisions of Schedule I of the act of Congress approved July 24, 1897, shall be substituted: *Provided*, That the rates of duty shall be the same as those imposed in said Schedule I of the act of July 24, 1897, less 20 per cent thereof."

#### GOODS IN BOND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I offer a resolution (S. Res. 146) for which I ask present consideration, and for fear the Secretary may not be able to follow my handwriting I will read it:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to furnish for the use of the Senate the following information:

1. The value of imported commodities now held under bond for warehousing or other purpose which have been entered without payment of duty.

2. The value of such commodities so held at the same time in the year 1912.

3. An estimate of the total amount of the duties payable upon such commodities under existing tariff laws.

4. An estimate of the amount of duties which would be payable under the proposed tariff bill, H. R. 3321, as the same is reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not object to the request, for the resolution is pertinent to the proposed amendment to the tariff bill submitted by the Senator from Utah on July 18.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### SEGREGATION ORDER IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CLAPP (by request) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 147), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas it is reported that there has been a segregation order issued by some unknown source or authority in the Post Office Department; and

Whereas the clerks and employees have worked together peacefully for over 50 years; and

Whereas the said segregation order will cost the Government of the United States over \$150,000: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be, and they are hereby, authorized to inquire into and to report by what authority the said segregation order was issued and what necessity, if any, exists for such order in the executive department after 50 years of perfect peace among the employees of the department, which order makes it very inconvenient for the clerks.

#### LIEUT. ROY C. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 148), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs or a subcommittee thereof are hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to investigate the charges preferred against Lieut. Roy C. Smith, formerly with the Asiatic Squadron, upon which his resignation was demanded after threatening trial by court-martial.

The said committee or subcommittee are for this purpose authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of Congress, at such times and places as they may deem desirable or practicable, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, to conduct hearings, and have reports of same printed for use.

#### THE TARIFF.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], at the top of page 29. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, when the Senate took an adjournment yesterday I was about to proceed to discuss the tariff on sheep.

Our present law has a duty on sheep of 75 cents per head if less than 1 year old and \$1.50 per head if more than 1 year. The Senate bill places sheep on the free list. France has a general duty of \$3.50 per 100 pounds and a minimum duty of \$2.19 per 100 pounds. Germany has a general duty of \$1.94 per 100 pounds and a conventional duty of 86 cents per 100 pounds. Austria-Hungary has a duty of 51 cents per head; Belgium 39 cents per head. England and the Netherlands admit sheep free. Italy imposes a duty of 58 cents per head plus the statistical tax of 2 cents. Spain has a duty of 77 cents per head, with a lower rate of 58 cents on sheep imported from favored countries. Russia has no duty on sheep. Canada has a general tariff of 25 per cent ad valorem, with an intermediate tariff of 22½ per cent. Mexico admits them free. Brazil has a rate of \$2.05 per head. Argentina has no duty on sheep. Japan assesses them \$1.49 per head. Australia protects her sheep with a rate of 48 cents per head. New Zealand admits them free.

The present law has a tariff of \$1.50 per head on swine. The Senate bill places them on the free list. Other countries have duties on swine as follows: England, free; France, general duty \$2.19 per 100 pounds, minimum duty \$1.31 per 100 pounds; Germany, general rate \$1.94 per 100 pounds, conventional duty 97 cents per 100 pounds; Austria-Hungary, 30 cents each on sucking pigs, \$2.44 on others weighing less than 264 pounds, and \$4.47 on hogs weighing more than 264 pounds; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 58 cents each if weighing less than 22 pounds, \$1.93 each if weighing more than 22 pounds; Spain, \$2.12 each; Russia, free; Canada, general rate 1½ cents per pound, intermediate rate 1½ cents per pound; Mexico, 50 cents per 100 pounds; Cuba, general rate, \$1.25 each, special rate to the United States, \$1 each; Brazil, \$2.56 per head; Argentina, free; Japan, 20 per cent ad valorem; Australia, \$1.20 each; New Zealand, free.

The Senate bill reduces the present rate of 30 cents per bushel on barley to 15 cents. The rates in some other countries are as follows: England, free; France, 13 cents per bushel; Germany, general rate, 36 cents per bushel; conventional rate, 21 cents per bushel; Austria-Hungary, general tariff, 18 cents per bushel; conventional tariff, 12 cents per bushel; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 17 cents per bushel plus a statistical tax of a little less than one-half cent a bushel; Spain, 17 cents per bushel; Russia, free; Canada, general tariff, 15 cents per bushel; intermediate tariff, 12½ cents per bushel; Mexico, 35 cents per bushel; Cuba, 14 cents per bushel; if for brewing purposes, 11 cents per bushel; Brazil, 39 cents per bushel; Argentina, 16 cents per bushel; Japan, 10 cents per bushel; Australia, 23 cents per bushel; New Zealand, 23 cents per bushel.

On oats our present rate is 15 cents per bushel; the Senate bill reduces this to 6 cents per bushel. In other countries the tariffs are as follows: England, free; France, 8.4 cents per bushel; Germany, general rate, 24 cents per bushel; conventional rate, 17 cents per bushel; Austria-Hungary, general rate, 18½ cents per bushel; conventional rate, 15 cents per bushel; Belgium, 8 cents per bushel; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 11 cents per bushel; Spain, 11 cents per bushel; Russia, free; Canada, general tariff, 10 cents per bushel; intermediate tariff, 9 cents; Mexico, 12 cents per bushel; Cuba, 7½ cents per bushel, with the usual 20 per cent reduction on American imports; Brazil, 29 cents per bushel; Argentina, 21 cents per bushel; Japan, 8 cents per bushel; Australia, 12 cents per bushel; New Zealand, 6 cents per bushel.

On rice the Senate bill reduces the present duty of 2 cents a pound, cleaned, and 1½ cents, uncleaned, to 1 cent and five-eighths cent a pound, respectively. Other countries have rates as follows: Great Britain, free; France, 70 cents per 100 pounds; Germany, pearled rice, general rate, 65 cents per 100 pounds; conventional rate, 43 cents per 100 pounds; rice, not cleaned, 43 cents per 100 pounds; Austria-Hungary, general rate, 55 cents per 100 pounds; conventional rate, 33 cents per 100 pounds; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 96 cents per 100 pounds; Canada, cleaned rice, general rate, 75 cents per 100 pounds; intermediate rate, 65 cents per 100 pounds; uncleaned rice and paddy, free; Mexico, 2 cents per pound; Cuba, 54 cents per 100 pounds, with a 40 per cent reduction if imported from the United States; Brazil, \$3.22 per 100 pounds; Argentina, 95 cents per 100 pounds; Japan, 38 cents per 100 pounds; Australia, \$1.46 per 100 pounds; 81 cents per 100 pounds, if uncleaned; New Zealand, 18 cents per 100 pounds. The committee has treated the rice growers fairly well compared to the treatment accorded other farmers. The only above countries having a higher duty on rice than the proposed rate



are Russia, 1½ cents per pound; Mexico, 2 cents; Brazil, almost 3½ cents; and Australia, about 1½ cents.

Wheat, the great staple product of the Northwest, and also extensively raised in the Middle West, is at present protected by a duty of 25 cents per bushel; the Senate bill places it on the free list. Other important countries have rates as follows: Great Britain, free; France, 37 cents per bushel; Germany, general rate 48½ cents per bushel, conventional rate 35½ cents; Austria-Hungary, general tariff 43 cents per bushel, conventional tariff 36½ cents; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 39 cents per bushel; Russia, free; Spain, 42 cents per bushel; Canada, general rate 12 cents per bushel, intermediate 10 cents; Mexico, 44 cents per bushel; Cuba, general rate 16 cents per bushel, to the United States 13 cents; Brazil, 14 cents per bushel; Argentina, seed wheat free, other wheat 25 per cent ad valorem, wheat except seed wheat is not specifically mentioned in the tariff act and would therefore be dutiable under the general provision that all goods not specifically charged with a duty and not exempted from duty shall pay a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem; Japan, 17 cents per bushel; Australia, 22½ cents per bushel; New Zealand, 11 cents per bushel. Great Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Russia are the only ones of these countries to place wheat on the free list.

The duty on flaxseed is reduced by the Senate bill from the present duty of 25 cents per bushel to 15 cents per bushel. In other countries we find the following rates: Great Britain, free; France, if used for seed, general rate 23 cents per bushel, minimum rate 17 cents per bushel, if used for any other purpose than for seed, free; Germany, general rate 4½ cents per bushel, conventional rate free; Austria-Hungary, free; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 23 cents per bushel; Russia, general rate 20 cents per bushel, conventional rate 12 cents; Spain, 5 cents per bushel; Canada, 10 cents per bushel; Mexico, 14 cents per bushel; Cuba, 32 cents per bushel with a 20 per cent reduction if imported from the United States; Brazil, \$1.13 per bushel; Argentina, flax for seed free, other flax 25 per cent ad valorem; Japan, 13 cents per bushel; Australia, 27 cents per bushel; New Zealand, free.

On potatoes there is at present a duty of 25 cents per bushel; the Senate bill places them on the free list. Other countries, I find, have rates as follows: Great Britain, free; France, if imported between March 1 and June 1, general rate 32 cents per bushel, minimum rate 16 cents per bushel; if imported at any other time, general rate 16 cents per bushel, minimum rate 2 cents; Germany, from February 15 to July 31, general rate 16 cents per bushel, conventional rate 6 cents; from August 1 to February 14, free; Austria-Hungary, general rate \$1.02 per bushel, conventional rate free; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, free; Russia, free; Spain, 6 cents per bushel; Canada, general tariff 20 cents per bushel, intermediate tariff 17½ cents; Mexico, 44 cents per bushel; Cuba, 18 cents per bushel; Argentina, free; Brazil, \$1.03 per bushel; Japan, 30 per cent ad valorem; Australia, 13 cents per bushel; New Zealand, 13 cents per bushel.

On corn there is at the present time a duty of 15 cents per bushel; the Senate bill places it on the free list. Tariffs in other countries are as follows: Great Britain, free; France, 15 cents per bushel; Germany, general rate, 30 cents per bushel—conventional rate, 18 cents; Austria-Hungary, 21 cents per bushel general rate—14 cents conventional rate; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 37 cents per bushel; Russia, free; Spain, 11 cents per bushel; Canada, not for distillation, free—if for distillation, 7½ cents per bushel; Mexico, 11 cents per bushel; Cuba, 10 cents per bushel; Brazil, 35 cents per bushel; Argentina, seed corn, free—other, 25 per cent ad valorem; Japan, 6 cents per bushel; Australia, 21 cents per bushel; New Zealand, 10 cents per bushel.

The Senate bill reduces the present duty of 6 cents per pound on butter to 2½ cents. The most important commercial countries have tariffs as follows on butter: Great Britain, free; France, general tariff \$2.63 per 100 pounds, minimum tariff \$1.75 per 100 pounds; Germany, general rate \$3.23 per 100 pounds, conventional duty \$2.16; Austria-Hungary, general rate \$3.22 per 100 pounds, conventional rate \$2.20 per 100 pounds; Belgium, \$1.75 per 100 pounds; the Netherlands, free; Italy, \$1.31 per 100 pounds; Russia, \$1.07 per 100 pounds; Spain, \$7.44 per 100 pounds; Canada, 4 cents per pound; Brazil, \$23.82 per 100 pounds; Argentina, almost 4½ cents per pound; Japan, \$11.14 per 100 pounds; Australia, 6 cents per pound; New Zealand, 30 per cent ad valorem.

On cheese, on which the Senate bill reduces the present duty of 6 cents per pound to 2½ cents, I find that foreign countries have duties as follows: Great Britain, free; France, general tariff, \$3.06 per 100 pounds, minimum tariff, \$1.05 to \$1.75 per

100 pounds, depending on kind; Germany, general rate, \$3.25 per 100 pounds; on certain kinds of cheese there is a conventional rate of \$1.62; Austria-Hungary, general rate, \$4.60 to \$5.52 per 100 pounds; on certain kinds there is a conventional rate ranging from \$1.10 to \$1.30 per 100 pounds; Belgium, on certain kinds, \$1.05 per 100 pounds; other kinds, free; the Netherlands, 91 cents per 100 pounds; Italy, general rate, \$2.09 per 100 pounds; conventional rate, 86 cents to \$1.31 per 100 pounds; Russia, general rate, \$12.83 per 100 pounds; conventional rate, \$10.27; Spain, general rate, 7 cents per pound; lower rates ranging from 1½ to 5½ cents on certain kinds; Canada, 3 cents per pound; Mexico, \$3.73 per 100 pounds; Cuba, \$2.95 per 100 pounds; 40 per cent reduction on imports from the United States; Brazil, \$23.06 per 100 pounds; Argentina, 9 cents per pound; Japan, \$7.72 per 100 pounds; Australia, 6 cents per pound; New Zealand, 30 per cent ad valorem.

On milk and cream there are at present duties of 2 cents and 5 cents a gallon, respectively. The Senate bill places both on the free list. Tariffs of other countries are as follows: Great Britain, free; France, general rate, 44 cents per 100 pounds; minimum rate, 22 cents; higher rates on condensed milk; Germany, free; Austria-Hungary, free; Belgium, free, unless intended for the manufacture of condensed milk or artificial butter; the Netherlands, free; Italy, free; Spain, general rate, \$6.57 per 100 pounds; certain countries enjoy a lower rate of \$4.38 per 100 pounds; Canada, general tariff, 3½ cents per pound; intermediate tariff, 3 cents; Mexico, free; Cuba, 13 per cent ad valorem; Brazil, 13 cents a pound; Japan, \$2.09 per 100 pounds; Australia, 4 cents per pound, if sweetened, 2½ cents, if unsweetened; New Zealand, 37½ per cent ad valorem.

Eggs, which are at present dutiable at 5 cents per dozen, are placed on the free list by the Senate bill. Other countries have duties on eggs as follows: Great Britain, free; France, general tariff, 88 cents per 100 pounds; minimum tariff, 53 cents; Germany, general rate, 65 cents per 100 pounds; conventional rate, 22 cents; Austria-Hungary, general rate, 74 cents per 100 pounds; conventional rate, free; Belgium, free, Netherlands, free; Italy, free; Russia, 26 cents per 100 pounds; Spain, first tariff, \$1.75 per 100 pounds; second tariff, \$1.31 per 100 pounds; Canada, general tariff, 3 cents per dozen; intermediate tariff, 2½ cents; Mexico, free; Cuba, \$2.95 per 100 pounds; Brazil, free; Argentina, \$1.05½ per 100 pounds; Japan, \$2.26 per 100 pounds; Australia, 12 cents per dozen; New Zealand, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The pending bill further proposes to reduce the rates of 3 cents per pound on live poultry and 5 cents per pound on dead poultry to 1 cent and 2 cents, respectively. Great Britain, of course, has no tariff on poultry; France has a general rate of \$2.63 per 100 pounds and a minimum rate of \$1.75; in Germany the general rate is 65 cents per 100 pounds and the conventional rate 43 cents; in Austria-Hungary the general rate on live poultry is 74 cents per 100 pounds; on dead poultry, \$2.30; the conventional rate is 37 cents per 100 pounds on live poultry and \$1.47 on dead poultry; Belgium, admitting live poultry free, assesses a duty of \$2.63 per 100 pounds on dead poultry; Netherlands, free; Italy, 44 cents per 100 pounds; Russia, free; Spain, 10 cents each; Canada, general tariff, 20 per cent ad valorem; intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; Mexico, free; Cuba, \$4.72 per 100 pounds; Brazil, 32 per cent ad valorem; Argentina, free; Japan, 20 per cent ad valorem; Australia, various rates; New Zealand, 30 per cent ad valorem.

On hay there is at present a duty of \$4 per ton. This the pending bill proposes to reduce to \$2 per ton. Other important countries have duties as follows: Great Britain, free; France, general rate, \$1.30 per ton; minimum rate, 86 cents; Germany, general rate, \$2.15 per ton; conventional rate, free; Austria-Hungary, free; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, no tariff duty, but subject to a statistical tax of about 19 cents per ton; Russia, free; Spain, \$1.75 per ton; Canada, general rate, \$2 per ton; intermediate rate, \$1.75; Mexico, free; Cuba, \$5.30 per ton, with a 20 per cent reduction on imports from the United States; Brazil, \$20.70 per ton; Japan, \$1.36 per ton; Australia, \$4.34 per ton; New Zealand, 30 per cent ad valorem.

On straw there is at present a tariff of \$1.50 per ton, which the pending bill reduces to 50 cents per ton. Other countries have duties as follows: Great Britain, free; France, general tariff, \$3.40 per ton, minimum tariff, \$1.76; Germany, general tariff, \$2.16 per ton, conventional tariff, free; Austria-Hungary, free; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Russia, free; Spain, fine straw, 88 cents per ton, straw for fodder, \$1.76; Canada, general tariff, \$2 per ton, intermediate tariff, \$1.75; Cuba, fine straw, \$20.98 per ton, if for fodder, \$5.30 per ton; Brazil, if for fodder \$20.70 per ton, if for other purposes, from 86 cents per 100 pounds to \$4.14 per 100 pounds, or from \$17.24 per ton



to \$81; Japan, 5 to 10 per cent ad valorem; Australia, \$4.35 per ton; New Zealand, 30 per cent ad valorem.

On rye there is at present a duty of 10 cents per bushel, which the pending bill proposes to remove. I find that other countries have duties on rye as follows: Great Britain, free; France, 15 cents per bushel; Germany, general rate, 42 cents per bushel, conventional rate, 30 cents; Austria-Hungary, general rate 36 cents per bushel, conventional rate, 30 cents; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, 22 cents per bushel; Russia, free; Spain, 20 cents per bushel; Canada, general rate, 10 cents per bushel, intermediate rate, 9 cents; Mexico, 42 cents per bushel; Cuba, 20 cents per bushel, with a reduction of 20 per cent if imported from the United States; Argentina, 26½ cents per bushel; Japan, 15 per cent ad valorem; Australia, 21 cents; New Zealand, 10 cents per bushel.

On wheat flour there is at present a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem, which this bill proposes to remove. Other countries have tariffs on flour as follows: Great Britain, free; France, 98 cents to \$1.40 per 100 pounds, according to quality; Germany, general rate, \$2.02 per 100 pounds, conventional rate, \$1.10; Austria-Hungary, \$1.36 per 100 pounds; Belgium, 18 cents per 100 pounds; the Netherlands, free; Italy, \$1.01 per 100 pounds; Russia, 64 cents per 100 pounds—it will be noted, Mr. President, that, while wheat is admitted free into Russia, there is a duty on flour of 64 cents per hundred pounds—Spain, \$1.23 per 100 pounds; Canada, general rate, 60 cents per barrel, intermediate rate, 50 cents; Mexico, \$2.48 per 100 pounds; Cuba, 59 cents per 100 pounds, with a reduction of 30 per cent if imported from the United States; Brazil, 58 cents per 100 pounds; Argentina, free; Japan, 70 cents per 100 pounds; Australia, 61 cents per 100 pounds; New Zealand, 29 cents per 100 pounds.

The pending bill also places all kinds of wool on the free list. Other countries have tariffs on wool as follows: Great Britain, free; France, raw wool, free; Germany, free; Austria-Hungary, free; Belgium, free; the Netherlands, free; Italy, free; Russia, slightly more than 4½ cents per pound; Spain, first tariff, \$2.18 per 100 pounds; second tariff, \$1.72 per 100 pounds; Canada, on wools such as are grown in Canada, general tariff, 3 cents per pound; intermediate tariff, 2½ cents; Mexico, 1½ cents per pound; Cuba, raw wool, 20 per cent ad valorem; Brazil, a little more than 4 cents per pound; Argentina, 25 per cent ad valorem; Japan, free.

Mr. President, I believe the foreign tariffs cited are sufficient to show the policies of those countries with regard to agricultural products. With the exception of such countries as Great Britain and the Netherlands, which do not expect to produce sufficient agricultural products for their own needs, and rely on other countries to furnish them with these necessities, it is the policy of other countries to give the farmer as well as the manufacturer such benefit as he may derive from a tariff on his products. The mere fact that the products of the farmer are primary necessities, while many manufactures have been made necessary by advancing civilization, is to my mind no reason why the producer of products of the soil should be discriminated against. Many manufactures are as much necessities as the products of the farm, and as to those that are not I can not see why it is a wise policy to encourage the production of what may be called luxuries rather than of necessities. We are able to produce enough farm products for our needs, and there is no reason to believe that we shall not be able to do so in the future. It is no answer to the objection of placing farm products on the free list to say that this is not a protective-tariff bill. No matter what you call the tariff, the effect of the duties imposed is the same. Whether you say that the purpose of a given duty is to raise revenue or to protect a domestic industry, if a duty is levied it will result in giving the producer of that article in this country an advantage in protecting to a greater or less extent his market from the competition of producers of the same article in other countries; and when you place a duty on the products of one man and place the products of another on the free list you discriminate against the latter to the same extent, whether you call your tariff a revenue tariff or a protective tariff.

The Democratic Members of Congress were responsible for the passage of the Canadian reciprocity treaty. It is true that some of the Republican Members, together with President Taft, supported this measure, but a majority of the Republican Members of both Houses opposed the measure and voted against it. When the Canadian reciprocity treaty was first presented to Congress it looked quite respectable. It had strong supporters back of it, it was the pet measure of President Taft, and was strongly indorsed by ex-President Roosevelt. The powerful influence of the press was behind it; the great milling industry favored it; the American Brewers' Association, whose baneful

and sinister influence has been felt more than that of any other trust, not only welcomed it but championed its cause. Even some of our Republican leaders were led to believe that it could do no harm but might be of some benefit, and it was not until some of the Members of the agricultural districts took a courageous stand against this iniquitous measure, and showed beyond a question of doubt that it was a discrimination and rank injustice to the American farmer and of no benefit to the consumer that the people realized the injurious effects of this measure. The leaders of the Democratic Party evidently saw the advantage to be gained by their party, and almost unanimously voted for and became the ardent supporters of the administration measure, and viewing it from a partisan standpoint it did not take a very bright mind to clearly see the political advantage to be gained by the Democratic Party in giving their support to this measure.

From a Democratic standpoint it worked well; it was an entering wedge toward free trade and was the means of widening the breach already existing in the Republican Party. So far as the Democrats were concerned it was, "Head I win, tail you lose."

The progressive Republicans in both branches of Congress attacked the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill not because it was a protective measure nor because they favored free trade, but because a promise was given the American people in the Republican national platform of 1908 that the tariff should be revised, and that this revision meant a downward revision there was no doubt. It was contended by these progressive Republicans that some of the items in the tariff bill were protected by duties unduly high. It was a mistake of both factions of the Republican Party not to agree upon a compromise measure, but, unfortunately, some of the leaders of the dominant party of that day had been in power so long that it was not an easy matter to convince them that they were neither omnipotent nor omniscient. There were then and there are now Republican Senators and Representatives possessing the honesty and the courage of their convictions who were not afraid to criticize and to rebel against the leadership that is contrary to the fundamental principles of the Republican Party. But it seems that in the councils of war that were held it was agreed to apply the steam-roller process to this little band of insurgents rather than to counsel with them; and so the inevitable has happened. The members of the party became hopelessly divided and the Democratic Party has again, as it always does, profited by the dissension and division in the Republican ranks, and as a result the country is again in the hands of Democracy.

You, my Democratic friends, have the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. I know that you will say that you gladly assume the responsibility of leadership; but, in my judgment, after four years of misrule you will again be hunting for excuses and explaining why we had hard times, if not a panic, and why millions of unemployed, willing workers were walking the streets looking for work and thousands of able-bodied men compelled to beg for bread. Such conditions as existed under the Cleveland administration are yet fresh in my memory, as it must be in the memory of everyone within the hearing of my voice, and while I hope and pray that such a calamity will not again befall the American people, yet the penalties imposed by writing into law the provisions of this bill lead me to believe that it is impossible for the American people to escape the dire punishment.

But you seem to have adopted the same method that the leaders of the Republican Party, to whom I have referred so strongly, used and abused. I believe there are Senators on that side who are dissatisfied with this bill; I believe there are Senators on that side who, if permitted to follow their own free will, would prefer to change many of its provisions, but the party lash has been applied by a most benevolent leader, the same as it was attempted to be applied by the leaders of the Republican Party when that party was dominant in the councils of this Nation. It ought to be manifest to everyone that our leaders erred, and I believe you are making the same mistake. By using the "Star-Chamber method," with the curtains carefully pulled down and the doors well guarded, you have made it possible for a minority of the Senate to control legislation which so vitally affects every industry and every individual citizen of this great land.

I am not complaining because the Democratic Party insists on passing a bill which is in accordance with their views. You have a majority in both branches of Congress, and you have a right to expect to pass a bill that will be satisfactory to the members of your own party, but I have the right to complain of the mode of procedure; I have the right to condemn—and I do condemn most severely—the action you have taken by making a bill in secret caucus. You have excluded the reporters of



the press; you have excluded Republican Senators; you have excluded the citizens of this great country who are engaged in the industries and are vitally interested and entitled to be heard.

Mr. President, I do not wish it to appear that it is in any spirit of partisanship that I refer to the Chief Executive of our Government, for it will be remembered that when the reciprocity treaty with Canada was pending before this body I did not hesitate to criticize a Republican President.

Mr. President, I came here with an open and receptive mind, believing it to be my duty as best I could to assist the Senate in making this bill; of course, not expecting it to fully meet with my approval, but to make it a better bill than it now is. But, Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to help draw this bill, nor do I expect that any suggestions I might make will meet the approval of the majority. When this bill passed the House it provided for a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat, and according to newspaper reports the Senate committee to which the agricultural schedule was referred was reported as favoring the provisions of the House bill with an amendment providing for a compensatory duty on the manufactured articles of wheat. But it has been said that the committee, at the request of President Wilson, placed wheat, together with practically all agricultural products, on the free list.

There are Senators in this Chamber who claim to know more, and I believe do know more, about the agricultural schedule than does President Wilson. There are Members in this body who know as much, if not more, about the needs of the agricultural classes in this country, especially the agricultural industry of the West, as the majority members of the Finance Committee, and if I am not wrong in my statement, then, Mr. President, the majority members of the Finance Committee have knowingly committed an injustice against the toiling millions who are engaged in that industry.

Mr. President, I know there are Senators on that side of the Chamber who rebelled against the secret caucus. I believe that you were warned by progressive Senators on that side and advised not to proceed to make this bill in the darkness of a secret caucus. I have been told that Members on that side rebelled against legislating in a secret caucus. Perhaps some Senator will say that the Republicans have nothing to do with this bill and that it is none of our business what kind of a bill the Democrats make, as they alone are willing to take the responsibility for this legislation.

I say in answer to that, it is our business; I say that so long as this bill is pending before this body I feel that it is not only our privilege but our duty to call attention to the great injustice that will be done to the people of this country by enacting this legislation. The great industry of agriculture is again the subject of an unjust onslaught and discrimination. Why is the Democratic Party so bitter in its opposition to the great industry of agriculture? What has the farmer done to incur the choler and hate of the Democratic Party? Perhaps Senators on that side will deny that they have any grievance against the farmer, but I call your attention to the fact that in my State alone, where in 1912 we raised more than 143,000,000 bushels of wheat, with short crops in foreign countries, under the provisions of this bill our farmers would lose in a single year more than \$15,000,000 on wheat. North Dakota produced last year nearly 13,000,000 bushels of flax, and the farmers who produce that crop will lose more than a million dollars a year under the provisions of this bill. Under the provisions of this bill the farmers of my State alone will lose from fifteen to twenty millions of dollars annually as long as it remains a law on the Federal statute books. Why, Mr. President, should I not be opposed to such an unjust measure?

Mr. President, I come from an agricultural State, and, knowing the true conditions of the people and the hardships they have to endure, the toil and labor they have to perform, the long hours of labor the farmer, his wife, and his children must, if they are going to keep the wolf from the door, of necessity perform, I feel justified in making this protest. I have said before and I repeat that I believe the farmer receives less pay per hour for his labor than any class of men engaged in any other industry. Not only that, but I believe that he receives smaller returns upon his investment than any other class engaged in any other industry. Farming is certainly a legitimate industry, and we had your assurances, my Democratic friends, that you would do no harm to any legitimate industry. The farmers have for these many years listened to coined phrases and beautiful, well-rounded sentences of eminent statesmen that agriculture is the foundation of all sources of wealth, and yet you ignore the demand of the farmers and refuse to write into this bill a provision that would in the future

give them some protection, and with complacency you add to their burden, which, under existing conditions, is much heavier than it ought to be.

The chairman of the Finance Committee said in his able speech in reporting this bill the other day that while the committee had placed wheat and other agricultural products on the free list, the committee had also made provisions in the bill to place agricultural implements on the free list. If I understood the Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the Finance Committee, correctly, he did not deny that there would be a loss to the American farmer by reason of placing his products on the free list, but that the farmer would be recompensed for this loss by the reduction in the price of farm implements. No doubt this statement was made in good faith and represented not only the views of the Senator from North Carolina, but the views of the majority members of the committee. But let us see for a moment to what extent the farmer will be compensated: The present law provides for a duty of 15 per cent on plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, hoes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins, with this proviso:

*Provided*, That any of the foregoing, when imported from any country, dependency, province, or colony, which imposes no taxes or duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be imported free of duty.

In a report on the International Harvester Co. of America made by the Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Corporations, under date of March 3, 1913, I find that the average factory cost of binders to the International Harvester Co. at its domestic plants for two years, 1910 and 1911 combined, was \$56.32. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that this company takes advantage of the duty imposed and no more, the factory price of harvesters would be \$56.32 plus the 15 per cent duty, or \$84.45; total, \$64.77. The farmer pays for these harvesters in North Dakota about \$150. The International Harvester Trust is a monopoly, and I believe it controls the business not only in the United States but in foreign countries. Now, what difference will it make to this great monopoly if the duty is taken off? In no way could they profit by the tariff any more than the figures I have quoted, \$84.45. It is not my wish to do anybody an injustice, but certainly I am not pleading for any protection for this or a like monopoly.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the protective tariff is alone responsible for the formation of this monopoly or trust; I believe it makes no difference to such large concerns as this whether they are protected by a tariff or not. The proportion of the harvesting-machine business of the United States controlled by the International Harvester Co. in 1911 was as follows: Grain binders, 87 per cent; mowers, 76.6 per cent; rakes, 72 per cent.

Mr. President, my sympathy is not with the great industrial trusts, but with the laborer, which includes the farmer, and with the small manufacturer, who at all times is struggling against opposition and unfair competition. This bill in no way injuriously affects the great trusts and monopolies of this country. They have grown so strong that no foreign competition can or will affect them. I believe that no one seriously contends that tariff regulation has much, if anything, to do with an industrial monopoly. Antitrust legislation is what is needed rather than tariff legislation to properly regulate the trusts.

Mr. President, I have gone into this question for the purpose of showing that great harm and injustice will be done to the struggling masses engaged in the pursuit of labor and other legitimate industries by a drastic change in the tariff policy of this country. I am sure that our Democratic friends are sincere in their belief that this bill will help the consumer. My belief, however, is that the consumer can not prosper unless the business of the country prospers. No great commercial country which is a large producer of agricultural products has ever succeeded by inaugurating a policy such as is embodied in the provisions of this bill. With the exception of England, which is practically a free-trade country—except, as I have stated before, in all her colonies the people are protected by a heavy tariff or duty, and all those colonies give to the people of England a protection, because they give to the people of England a preferential rate which is just as beneficial to the people of England as a protective tariff is beneficial to the people of the United States—Russia is the only country that is a large producer of agricultural products that does not provide for heavy tariff duties on her agricultural products. I admit that any country which produces a large surplus will be, to a certain extent, dependent on the world's market for the price of her products, but in a country where the consumption equals production there can be no question about the benefit



of a protective tariff on the products of the farm as well as the products of the factory.

The title of this bill reads, "To reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes." The duties have not only been reduced, but on certain articles and on one certain schedule—the agricultural schedule—the duties have been practically removed. I believe I may be permitted to say that there is no protection to the farmer in this bill. The tariff duties remaining in this bill are certainly not going to benefit the farmers in the West; a discrimination seems to have been made between the East and the West. I do not wish to array section against section or one class against another class, but the bill speaks for itself. The farmer of the West is denied duty on his wheat, but the rice grower of the South has the benefit of a tariff duty on rice. All through this bill there is a discrimination against the farmer of the West. It is manifest that the framers of this bill have had in view the idea of benefiting the consumer; but who is the consumer? Statistics prove to us that more than 33,000,000 people live on farms and are actually engaged in the industry of farming. More than 49,000,000 people live in what is called the rural districts. Only about 42,000,000 live in cities that have more than 2,500 population, so that a majority of the consumers live in the country and not in the city.

The farmer is not only a large consumer of food products, but a heavy purchaser of all kinds of manufactures. He must buy his wearing apparel, as well as the consumer in the city. It may be admitted that the consumer in the city uses large sums of money for luxuries, such as theaters, wines, liquors, and beer. It is natural, of course, that the farmer has incurred the enmity of the brewers and liquor trusts because of his strong support of the cause of temperance. It is perfectly evident that the farmer is not the brewer's friend. Is it not reasonable to believe that if the consumer in the city would follow the example of the farmer in practicing economy, denying himself of the luxuries just as the farmer of necessity must do, there would be less reason for complaint about the "high cost of living"?

In my opinion, this tariff bill is not framed on the scientific principles of either free trade or protection. It is neither "fish, fowl, nor herring," and I am as firm in my belief as I am earnest in pleading for certain amendments, that it will not benefit the consumer, because, to a great extent, it will injure, if not destroy, the producer.

The decree from the White House has, by the dark-lantern method in a "Star-Chamber caucus," been ratified by the Democratic majority, and it is perfectly manifest that any attempt to amend this bill is as impossible and will have no more consideration than would a popular demand by the common people of Russia petitioning the Czar for a more popular government.

It is obvious that party solidarity is playing a strong hand in the making of this bill; on many of the items a vote has been taken, and after lengthy and intelligent discussions by the Republicans, and when it has been clearly shown that the bill should be changed you have voted unanimously to sustain the action of the majority members of the committee. Judging from your action and the votes already taken on certain items in this bill, I believe that you will stick together in solid phalanx, right or wrong, and no matter what kind of an amendment is presented, whether it is to vote the tariff up or down, no Senator on that side will dare to break away, but will follow the plan mapped out for him by his leader, because breaking away might be the means of disintegrating party solidarity, which at the present time is playing such a prominent rôle and is of such great importance to the Democratic Party, but of no value to the country.

I believe there are a few on that side who are smarting under the party whip, but for fear that it might be said that you are not good Democrats you fear breaking away. I want to call your attention to one important fact—that you won your victory in the last election by reason of the division in the Republican Party and by reason of your declaration and pretense that it does not make so much difference to which party we belong if we are right with the people.

In the Western States, where the Republicans are in an overwhelming majority, you have for years conducted your campaign upon this demagogic pretense that it is a question of patriotism and not partisanship. I am not charging you with anything except what the people of the country will be ready to sustain me in. I want to say right now that I believe the people will not again be deceived by your pretense and false promises, nor by your pretended indifference to party solidarity. At any rate, your statements to that effect will not go unchallenged, because the people are entitled to know the truth. History will again repeat itself, and the stone that was

laid aside will again be selected as the corner stone of the grand structure. The Republican Party, which at the last election was humiliated by the American people, will again be triumphant and reunited upon patriotic, progressive principles as laid down by Abraham Lincoln. Selfishness and personal ambition will not be mistaken for patriotism and progress, for the seed of envy and deception will find no fertile soil in which to fasten its destructive roots; certain it is they will find no place in the hearts of the rank and file of the American people. Under our changed conditions the people will be the leaders and will select men to represent them who by their acts have demonstrated that they believe in the fundamental principles of a people's government.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the conclusion of the routine morning business to-morrow I shall address the Senate on the pending bill.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, it appears that the majority party in Congress propose to enact a tariff law so as to change the existing law without regard to results. Our country has been enjoying a higher degree of prosperity under the tariff law now in force than ever existed previously. Just now while there is more money per capita in the land than ever before, there is a stringency in the money centers due to the proposed tariff changes and consequent unsettling of business affairs. The people are discounting the action of Congress, knowing there is a majority in each Chamber pledged to make radical alterations in the law, so that duties will be imposed for revenue only, and that a protection of our industries will be ignored.

The tariff question is far-reaching. It enters into every ramification of business. By its wise administration all kinds of business will be fostered and advanced. By its unwise administration every character of industry will be injuriously affected. Both private and public credit may be made the objects of its adverse influence. Business will become torpid, clogged, and stagnated. We should consider what happenings may be occasioned thereby in the commercial and business circles and affairs of our people and of the Government. What produces the condition of prosperity we now enjoy? Is it not that those who are endowed with energy, intelligence, and physical capacity are availing themselves of favorable opportunities to forge ahead? Nearly all are gathering in more of wealth than they expend. Industrial incomes exceed expenses. The Nation's income exceeds its expenses. The large balance of trade in favor of our country and its business is rapidly enriching our people and constantly pours wealth into their laps. This balance of trade in our favor amounted to over six hundred millions for the fiscal year last past. This is due mainly, if not entirely, to the existing tariff law, which enables us to build up our industries and not only supply our wants, but export largely in excess of what we import. The greatest industry in New Mexico is that of wool and sheep. It has been said that the sheep and woolen industries in the United States have existed since the formation of this Government—that they are not now self-sustaining and do not furnish enough wool to supply this country—that consequently they should not be protected. We do not furnish enough wool to supply all the wants of the United States.

The amount of wool consumed in this country during the year 1912 was about 496,000,000 pounds. Of this amount we produced 304,000,000 pounds and imported about one hundred and ninety-three and a half million pounds, of which amount we exported about one million and a half. The woolen industry of to-day can not be said to be the woolen industry which has existed since the commencement of our Government, for the reason that since the acquisition of the Louisiana purchase and the territory ceded by Mexico and the opening up of the West the growing of wool has in a great measure gravitated to the plains and prairies near to and in the range of the Rocky Mountains. The sheep raiser who went there has had much to contend with. First, he had to meet the savage who was constantly depredating upon and raiding his flocks. He was compelled to guard against predatory wild animals. He was far removed from the center of industry and markets, and was compelled to meet high rates of freight, sometimes amounting, in early days, to 10 and 15 cents per pound. The cost of his living was fivefold what it is now. He was not always able to obtain sufficient labor of a proper kind to care for his flocks. But he was opening up the great West, building up that portion of the country which was unsettled and unoccupied. He was performing the part of a pioneer—the man who builds countries and empires and lays the foundation on which to make them grow. During the Civil War the woolgrowers supplied the loss of cotton, which had been advanced to over a dollar per pound. Without the woolgrowers' aid, the cost of clothing to the Union Army would have been threefold greater than it was. Can it be



wondered that the sheep industry, which drifted to the West under such circumstances as this, did not build up as fast or as rapidly as was anticipated or expected by the people living in the Eastern States, who did not know that such difficulties were encountered or to be encountered? The Indian or savage question has to a certain extent been determined. In determining it large tracts of land, amounting in many instances to as much as a thousand acres for every man, woman, and child of the Indians, have been set apart for their use. The sheep raiser has been driven from the borders thereof and prohibited the use of a single blade of grass thereon. He has been compelled to hunt other and different grazing grounds. As this industry in the West increased and became more profitable on account of the savage being restrained and limited in his field of operations, the killing off of wild animals, and greater facilities for cheaper rates of freight, the wool business from year to year in that section of the country grew more prosperous. All portions of the Rocky Mountain region may be said to be valuable for sheep and Angora goat raising; the sheep occupy the prairie ranges and slopes of the mountains, the goats go into the rough and rugged hills and amongst the brush where sheep can not go without losing a portion of the wool. That portion of the country has not yet filled up to its full capacity. Some portions of it are better adapted to sheep raising than others. In the northern portion sheep have to be fed a portion of the year and sheltered. In the southern portion such is not the rule. The northern sheep, however, grow larger and quicker and produce a heavier fleece of wool and in a measure compensate for the extra expense that they have to bear.

There has been another drawback to sheep raising through the entire country, and that is just such action as is now being taken by the party in power, which from time to time as it acquired control has taken away from the wool and sheep industry the protection it had against the foreign cheap industries, foreign cheap labor, and foreign cheap lands. To-day the sheep raiser in the West is not only confronted with a large number of Indian reserves of great area, from which he is entirely excluded, but he is confronted with various other kinds of reservations of public land, such as forestry reservations, which have been established in all of the Western States, some of them to the extent of at least half the entire area of the State, and in all of the Western States to the extent of absorbing nearly all of the water which is necessary for the use of live stock in ranging and grazing. To-day nearly every sheep owner in New Mexico is compelled to rent lands from the Government for the ranging and grazing of his sheep during those seasons of the year when there is no rainfall or precipitation. He is compelled to pay therefor on an average of 12 cents per head. Some very small herds are able to exist otherwise because their owners happen to have title to lands where they have water sufficient to supply such small flocks. The large flock owners do not own sufficient land on which to range their flocks. They are compelled to go upon the public domain, where there is no water except during the rainy season or in the winter. During the other seasons of the year, when there is no rain or precipitation, they are compelled to rent from the Government on the forest reserves for a few months. This has been the practice for the last 10 years or more. The public domain in New Mexico is fast being occupied. Water can be found sufficiently near the surface to enable the sheep raiser to pump it for the use of his flocks, provided he is assured in some way that he can have land enough around and near his well at all times to enable him to get to it and to utilize it. As a rule this can not be done; the adjacent lands are generally taken up by others. There is much of the land in the West which can never be reduced to practical farming. Dry farming in some localities has proven a success while they do not have a drought.

The Government has adopted a policy of not allowing a homesteader to acquire more than 320, and in some localities not more than 160 acres of land. These lands have no running water on them. They must be supplied by precipitation or by sinking a well and pumping it. This makes it too expensive for the homesteader to raise a crop or live stock, especially in view of the fact that when, in the changes occasioned by political party strife, that party which is now in power gets hold of the reins of government and endeavors to take away the protection which the sheep grower has, not only for his sheep but for his wool, and place him in competition with the cheap labor of the Argentine Republic and Australia, where there are no predatory animals, where there are no savages, where ample ranges can be had and sheep cared for at a minimum cost. During such times the number of our sheep is always reduced in quantity. By the Wilson-Gorman bill wool was placed upon the free list. Sheep were taxed 20 per cent ad valorem.

This bill puts them on the free list. The number of our sheep during nearly four years of the existence of that enactment went down from 52,000,000 to 36,000,000.

The value of sheep in New Mexico went down from \$3 per head to 75 cents per head; the value of wool from 18 cents per pound to 4 and 5 cents per pound. The number of sheep in New Mexico was reduced at least one-half. The sheep raiser was discouraged. The small flock owner, not having means beyond his previous current income to support himself and family adequately, was compelled to sell out and dispose of his holdings. These were naturally purchased by those who were able to command sufficient cash with which to do it. If he could not find a purchaser of that kind, he sold them for mutton, and they went to the slaughter pen. In this way one-third of the sheep of the country at large, which amounted to about 52,000,000, the same as now, went out of existence, and three-fourths of the value of the remainder was lost. This loss not only fell upon the sheep owner, but also upon the State and upon the people at large. If this bill is carried into law, which it seems the majority have determined upon, a blow will be given to the sheep industry which will extinguish it, unless those people interested in sheep shall do as they did in 1894 and 1895—buy up all the holdings of the small owners and carry the large flocks into what would be denominated by the majority in power as a trust or monopoly.

This act is simply an act to create a wool and sheep monopoly, which will concentrate into the hands of a few most of the sheep of this country which may be retained from the slaughter pens. It will not only compel the small holder to sell his sheep, but it will compel him to sell his farm or his ranch in the Western States. The sheep owners in Ohio and in some of the Eastern States may be able to retain their property by reason of the fact that they are in very small flocks upon the farms and are a mere incident to the conduct of the farm, cared for at comparatively little additional expense. They are small enough so that shelter in the winter can be had for them, and cheap food is accessible. Is it policy to break down this industry simply because it does not furnish enough wool to supply the wants of the entire country? That can not be claimed for the purpose of raising a revenue. Its value is now \$250,000,000 for sheep alone. Do you believe that by breaking down this industry, curtailing the number of sheep in the United States, forcing our people to go abroad to obtain the manufactured articles or to obtain wool with which to manufacture will cheapen the cost of clothing?

The duty that is now on wool amounts to less than 20 cents per pound on the scoured product; probably does not exceed 12 or 15 cents per pound, owing to the fact that foreign imported wools only shrink 45 per cent; and a majority of all the wool which is imported comes in under the third class and pays duty mostly at the rate of 4 cents in the grease, some of it at 7 cents, while nearly two-thirds of that amount is immediately put into the manufacture of cloth and thus competes with our clothing wools, which is practically the only kind we produce in the United States. Assuming that the duty on wool as it now stands would be as much as 15 cents on the scoured product, and that 5 pounds of scoured wool is more than enough to make an average suit of clothes, we have 75 cents in a suit of clothes at the outside which represents duty. Can it be said that that is a great reduction in the cost of living? No more than one woollen suit in a year is used by each individual on the average; not that much. For an average family of six people that would be four dollars and a half. But are we sure that if we put wool upon the free list we will correspondingly reduce the price of the manufactured article?

We have been inveighing in this country against trusts and monopolies. We know comparatively little about the operations of trusts and monopolies, when that trust and monopoly is formed in a foreign country to operate on the outside of that foreign country and in our own borders. We have no means of controlling it. We can not reach it, except by a tax upon its products or its property here.

A few years since, on a visit to London, I conferred with one of the proprietors of the largest wholesale operators in woollen goods there and informed him that I would like to make some purchases. His first question to me was, "Where do you desire to take them or have them delivered?" I stated in the United States. He then said, "We have an agent in New York from whom all purchases of our goods must be made. We will not sell except through him and at the prices which have been fixed for him there." I informed him that I knew of his agent, but that the price which he had fixed on their merchandise was much above the price which they held in London on the same, even with the freight to New York and the United States duty added. In fact, it exceeded it by at least one-third. He stated



that he knew that, but that that was their privilege. They knew that we had to have these goods and they would fix their own price.

I asked him if there was not competition through other firms. He stated that two other firms on the Continent of Europe furnished the same kind of articles they did, but that I could not buy from them because they already had an agreement that no goods should be sold for delivery in America except at the prices fixed by their New York agent. He then stated to me there was not an industry in Europe wherein the different operators thereof could not be combined within 24 hours to fix a price for delivery in a foreign country, like ours, so that the same could not be had for less than the fixed price. The experience of this country has been that when the tariff duties on different articles which we were furnishing in this country, but not in sufficient quantities to supply the entire demand, were reduced below the standard of protection, foreign dealers have, as soon as the tariff rate took effect, poured into our country at a reduced price, large amounts of their products until they have destroyed our manufactories. They have gone below a competing price so as to break up the business here. As soon as that had been accomplished, they not only restored the old price, but put it much higher.

It will not be necessary in this case for the woolgrower in Australia and Argentina to sell his wool in this country at a loss. He can bring it here and sell it at 10 cents a pound and break up every woolen industry we have. Freights for him are not more than one-half what they are for us. His means of handling are better. The woolen manufactories are mostly upon the Atlantic coast and are easily accessible to him. When the sheep grower can not run his sheep at a profit, he will be compelled to dispose of his holdings at whatever price he can get, if he can not look ahead and see there will be a change in the condition of things and be able to hold his flocks until such change comes.

It is said by some that sheep can be raised for mutton. The sheep in the West can not so be raised profitably. A mutton sheep requires to be fed. The stock of sheep which is held in New Mexico is of the merino grade, which is a small sheep and produces a very little carcass. It costs at least \$2 per head a year to actually care for sheep. If the sheep is sold the first year you can not realize more than that amount on it.

It has to be freighted to the market; it must be fed up to make it of a marketable quality; and while it may sell in the market at Chicago or Kansas City or farther east for \$5 or \$6 a head, you can not get more than 5 cents a pound at the best for it on the plains in the West, and the lambs which are produced never average more than 50 pounds to the head. The older sheep do not sell for so much per pound as they increase in age. The prices for their meat depreciates, and yet the expense for caring for them goes on. It is estimated at least 5,000,000 of our people are depending upon the sheep and woolen industry in the United States. As said, there are about 52,000,000 sheep in the United States. The raising of wool necessitates the employment of three men, on an average, for every 1,500 sheep. This means if all the sheep were in herds of 1,500 that there would be 100,000 employees thrown out of employment by the destruction of that industry, but as probably three-fourths of the sheep are in smaller herds than that it means that about 150,000 herders would be thrown out of employment if the sheep industry should be destroyed by putting wool and sheep on the free list.

In their program the majority propose to reduce the duty on the woolen manufactures at least 50 per cent. This means now what it meant in 1894 and 1895, the closing up of nearly every mill—in fact, of every mill where the proprietors have not the means of holding on for four years longer until the people, recognizing the outrage which will have been placed upon them by the enactment of this bill into a law, shall turn the majority out and put those back who will look after their interests and their welfare in a more substantial way. But in these manufactories there are now employed about \$460,000,000 and about 169,000 employees. It is safe to say that three-fourths of these employees will be discharged if this bill is enacted into a law. The remaining one-fourth will have their salaries reduced at least one-third. The 5,000,000 people depending on wool and its industries will practically have their means of livelihood cut off. They will have to go out and hunt labor or starve. If they go into the field of other labor, competition immediately arises. The operator is naturally human; he is looking out for his own interest and his own welfare; he will employ labor where he can get it the cheapest, taking into consideration its efficiency. It will not be difficult to train factory hands who have been engaged in a business such length of time as these woolen employees have to engage in any other

enterprise. If it is thought that putting wool upon the free list and reducing the duty on the manufactured article 50 per cent will contribute to cheap living, I think that those who have such belief will find they are mistaken. A foreign monopoly will intervene and keep the prices up. If it is thought that a greater revenue may be obtained, that would be more than doubtful. In order to get a greater revenue you must import more than double the amount of merchandise of that quality to make up for the reduction in the rate of duties. When you do that, what is the result? You send out of the country the necessary money to purchase the same or to purchase the wool to make the same. That money is a portion of our wealth, a wealth which should be permanent and kept permanently with us, but which will be sent away to pay for this increased importation. The amount of circulation per capita will by that means be reduced throughout the entire country.

The 52,000,000 sheep in the United States must be run in flocks not exceeding 1,800 head to the flock. A flock of 1,500 head is even more profitable. When they get below 1,500 head the cost of caring for them becomes greater per head. It requires in New Mexico three men to each flock of 1,500 or 1,800 to care for them. They receive to-day an average of \$30 per month for wages, and also receive their board and camping facilities. Their board will average \$20 per month. The wages and board of each man per year would be \$600; for the three men, \$1,800; or about an average of \$1 per head per sheep, which can be safely run in a flock. But this is not all the expenses of a herd. The owner has to pay the Government 12 cents per head for a range or grazing right. The loss from his herd is about 15 per cent each year by deaths from predatory animals and disease and estrays. It costs him about 6 cents a head to shear his sheep; as much more to attend to the lambing; 15 cents per head as taxes. He is compelled, if he has more than one herd, to employ an extra high-priced man, at \$100 per month, to look after all the herds.

He has the expense of 5 cents a fleece for sacking and hauling his wool to market. He has an investment of at least \$5 per head on which he should receive, according to the bankable rates in New Mexico, 8 per cent interest, which would amount to 40 cents per head. Not only does he have all these expenses, but he has a number of other incidental expenses which can not be accurately estimated, all amounting to more than \$2 per head per annum. Before he markets his male lambs, he has the same proportionate expense as to them, amounting to at least \$1 per head, to be deducted from the amount realized on them. He is also subject to the loss of his entire herd from drouths, snowstorms, prairie fires, and disease epidemics. It is not infrequent that whole herds have been lost in snowstorms. During the present year in New Mexico there has been a drouth, and the average crop of lambs will not exceed 30 per cent. It is said they will not exceed the number of the amount of losses of the old sheep, which have died on account of the drouth, so that practically this year there has been no increase in the flock which can be sold off as a profit. The wool has had to pay the whole income.

It has been selling at from 10 to 12 cents during the year, the sheep averaging not exceeding 6 pounds per head, or about 66 cents to the head, so that every sheep owner in New Mexico during the present year has lost at least \$1.34 cents on every head of sheep. These are casualties which happen to the sheep industry. The income of 1,500 head of sheep is 9,000 pounds of wool at 11 cents per pound, or \$990; 900 lambs, one-half males, worth \$2.50 per head, or \$1,125; or a total of \$2,025, while his expenses amount to \$4,270. This leaves him a loss of \$2,245 per year against which he has 450 ewe lambs, less 270 old sheep loss, or 180 ewe lambs increase in his flock of ewes. He has also other depreciations, such as in the use of bucks and camp supplies. The ewe lambs will be worth \$5 per head, or \$900 for the 180 increase, leaving his total loss \$1,345 per year, at the value which will be produced by the present law, but his sheep will not retain their value of \$5 per head under this proposed law. It will go down. As time moves on and the sheep owner improves his financial condition, he will be able to provide shelter and furnish food for the winter when required.

The predatory wild animals are being killed off; lately, however, New Mexico has been flooded with them by their being driven over from Texas lands, which have been filled up with settlements. Better means are provided to guard against disease. The sheep owner is able from year to year to better care for his flocks and herds. But under the present bill within a year or two after it takes effect there will not be more than 250 sheep owners in New Mexico, while to-day there are over 2,500, owning herds from 250 head to ten and twenty thousand in quantity. While you are undertaking to reduce the cost of



living by reducing the price of wool and the price of sheep you are creating a monopoly which is taking away from the poor man his sheep at an insignificant price and placing them in the hands of the wealthy or monopolists. This will be the result with reference to sheep. It will also be the result with reference to sugar.

New Mexico is not a sugar-producing State at present, owing to the fact that we have been kept in the condition of a Territory, where our laws were subject to be repealed at the will of Congress and interpreted and administered by men who were not the choice of the people, but were appointed by an Executive not acquainted with our conditions and circumstances, and residing 2,000 miles away from us. We have never been able to induce capitalists to invest their means in sugar plants so as to enable us to grow the beets to supply them, for the reason that while we were a Territory no capitalist was willing to place his money where the laws could be repealed by a superior authority to that which enacted them, as could have been done by Congress, leaving no remedy in the courts or elsewhere. Since we became a State the attention of capitalists has been directed to New Mexico, and much inquiry and investigation has been had in regard to the availability of the lands of New Mexico for producing the sugar beet and manufacturing sugar. Many capitalists have been making contracts for the procuring of the lands so that they could be used for supplying the necessary beets for factories.

They have also been getting their means ready, and many of them had already provided means for the erection of sugar-beet factories in New Mexico at the time the election in November, 1912, took place. Then the people, acting upon the experience which they had and the example which had been given to them by the action of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration which was elected in 1892, absolutely ceased to make any further advance by way of opening up New Mexico to beet-sugar culture or to the production of sugar. Contracts which have been made have been forfeited. Moneys which have been provided have been otherwise disposed of. The capitalists have gone in other directions or are holding their means in safety vaults awaiting to have the Democratic landslide of destruction go by. And he will wait till the end of four years, until the people at the polls can see the results of the action of this Congress in passing this bill, when they will no longer tolerate a party in power to act regardless of the welfare of the people and in restraint of prosperity. The soils of New Mexico have been extensively tested for their capacity to grow sugar beets, and it has been found that they produce as rich beets in sugar-producing qualities as any soils in the world.

Most all of our soils are composed of the richest mountain loam, from 3 to 10 feet deep. They have every quality in them which is necessary to grow the beet which produces the most sugar. We have a rich and bright sunshine for 300 days in the year, which it is said adds to the sugar-producing quality of the beet. It is also claimed that we can produce two to three times as many beets to the acre in our valleys by reason of the fact that they have to be irrigated, than can be produced in the Eastern States, where they rely upon the rainfall. The crop is absolutely sure and is always of a uniform quality. It is true the cost is greater where rains do not prevail. In our States ditches have to be dug, water has to be obtained from distant sources. These ditches have to be kept in repair; men have to be employed to let the water upon the land and to distribute it constantly, an expense which does not attach to rainfall. In a country which would have a steady and constant rainfall, possibly like the State of Louisiana, to supply its want with water, without ditches and irrigation and extra labor for that purpose, they can probably produce the cane sugar as cheaply as the beet sugar, although they can not produce as much to the acre.

There is no conflict between the cane producer and the beet-sugar producer. We use in the United States about 7,966,000,000 pounds of sugar annually. Of this amount we produce in the continental United States 1,922,840,000 pounds, and we bring in from Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines 2,375,325,000 pounds, making a total of about 4,298,165,000 pounds which the United States and its dependencies produce and about 3,668,368,000 pounds which we import from foreign countries. In 1890 we produced in continental United States 301,000,000 pounds of cane sugar and 5,000,000 pounds of beet sugar. Since that time the cane sugar, which has increased with some variations annually, has gained steadily until it has reached 728,000,000 pounds. The beet-sugar industry has advanced steadily each year until it has reached 1,200,000,000 pounds, the cane-sugar increase during the last year being nearly 14,000,000 pounds. It has been said that this industry has existed and had protection for 100 years and has not succeeded in produc-

ing as much sugar as we require. We respectfully submit that an increase of nearly 150 per cent in the cane-sugar industry in the last 20 years shows a very respectable increase, one that should not be deemed an industry which is lagging behind.

We also submit that an increase from 5,000,000 pounds of beet sugar to 1,200,000,000 pounds, an increase of 2,400 per cent in 20 years, is a very respectable showing. Each of these industries has increased much faster than the growth of population or the increase of general wealth in the country, there being such an increase in the last 20 years of the two. Can it be said that this is an industry that ought not to be fostered or ought not to be helped, when it is making such extraordinary strides toward prosperity and toward furnishing the wants of the whole people? Every pound of sugar we introduce from abroad we have to send away money to pay for it, which is loss to us. Every pound of sugar that we produce in the United States saves that much money from going abroad and retains it for circulation and for use in the general development and progress of our country. Germany, which is a large beet-sugar producing country, pays a bounty for every pound of sugar exported by her people. The beet-sugar industry has not existed in the United States in any appreciable degree more than 20 years, and, in fact, so that it could be felt in the market, more than 13 years.

In the year 1900 it reached the amount of 163,000,000 pounds. That same year cane sugar produced 333,000,000 pounds. In the year 1900 we consumed in the United States 4,477,000,000 pounds of sugar, and we supplied only about 1,100,000,000 pounds on the continent, and from Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines less than one-fourth. So that it will be seen that the sugar industry is growing much faster than the consumption. We must in time supply all the sugar we consume, and that time is not far distant. We have area enough in the United States of the best sugar-beet producing lands, not only to supply the present wants of the United States, but what we will need probably for hundreds of years to come. It is stated by prominent Senators of the majority that they know that placing sugar upon the free list will destroy the industry. That can not be advocated either in the interest of revenue nor in the interest of cheapening the product. If you destroy four billions and a half of pounds of the product produced in the United States, we will have to import it from foreign countries. The labor which is necessary to produce it here will be thrown out of employment. To-day our laborer has not only to compete with the cheaper labor of Germany, but the German laborer gets a bonus from the Government for his work.

The capital amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars which is invested in it will go to ruin as it is not fitted for any other purpose. The lands which are now occupied by them may be occupied by something else, but whether it will be as profitable will have to be ascertained by an experiment.

It is said that the balance of trade, when in our favor to any considerable amount, shows prosperity, and certainly it must help to produce prosperity.

In the year 1893, namely, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1893, and extending to June 30, 1894, the imports exceeded the exports by about \$19,000,000. This was a year in which the majority party now in power had the entire administration of the Government, including the President and a majority in both Houses of Congress and every Cabinet position. They had come into power on the 4th of March before that year commenced. It is claimed that the Wilson-Gorman bill, which was enacted in 1894, had no influence upon the panic which was prevailing during that time, but that the panic had commenced some 13 or 14 months prior to the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman bill.

A claim of that kind certainly is made without reference to the intelligence of the business people in this country. The Democratic Party went into power under the election held in November, 1892, on a platform almost identical with the platform which was adopted at Baltimore and under which they have gone into power again, especially on that portion of it which refers to the tariff. They having been elected, of course, on a platform of that kind and pledged to carry it out, the American people and the American business men then looked forward to the results which were going to happen. They were like John Hay says about the engineer, Jim Bludso, on the *Prairie Belle*, when she was afe, when he said:

I'll hold her nozzle agin the bank  
Till the last galoot's ashore.

And Hay says:

And they all had trust in his cussedness  
And knew he would keep his word.

The American business man in 1893 had trust in the cussedness of the Democratic Party, and knew they would keep their

word. They discounted what you would do, and they did not make any mistake. You did, then, exactly what you said you were going to do.

The result was that in anticipation of what you were going to do, relying upon it, having trust in your cussedness, a panic was commenced in this country which culminated after the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman law, in the greatest sacrifice of wealth and prosperity that has ever been known in the history of any country. It is true that at that time the conditions of the country were not as prosperous as they are now. It may be that you will be enabled to enact this law in carrying out your cussedness, but you can not do it without producing a stringency in business, without creating trouble financially. In fact, as it was in 1893, we are beginning now to feel the effects of this proposed law. To-day stocks in the market have a downward tendency. The banks have their vault doors close shut against the man who is asking aid to enable him to invest in new business or carry on the old. The great prosperity that exists now may prevent, and I hope will prevent, a panic such as that of 1894. But you can not throw out of employment the wage earners who will be thrown out by this bill and cause them to compete with others who are holding positions, without creating great want and a great diminution in the amount of wages.

What use is the cheap cost of living to the wage earner if he has not the means with which to pay it? If you are going to fix it so that he will lose what he has, entirely, or a large portion of it, by the reduction of a third or a half of his income, simply to reduce his living expenses, that will add nothing to his prosperity, to his business, or to the happiness and comfort of his family. They must live, they must exist, they must have some comforts. Will you take away from them all of the conveniences of life and throw them into want? You will do it by the enactment of this law, unless something else may intervene. The only thing that will prevent you from bringing on a more destructive panic than that of 1894 will be the good sense of our people, their present state of prosperity, the fact that most of them have a surplus of means on which they can draw, the fact that they will look forward to the time when another party will take your place in the administrative and legislative branches of this Government and restore to the people the capacity to reclaim the prosperity which they now have, and which you will have destroyed or greatly damaged.

Wool and sugar are not the only features of this bill to which I desire to call attention. New Mexico is also a mineral-producing State, not as great as several others of the Western States, but still possessing within her borders great mountain ranges filled with mineral of all kinds. No duties are imposed upon gold, silver, and copper, when imported. The precious metals do not need protection. They have the same value the world over. No law could be passed to make them possess a different value, except in a coined state as money. Copper is furnished in this country in greater abundance than any other and is easier extracted and marketed. But New Mexico and various other Western States produce zinc and lead. These articles are also produced in some of the Eastern States, like Missouri and Illinois. Probably the greatest amount is produced near the western border of Missouri and the eastern border of Kansas. Under the existing law there is 1½ cents duty per pound on the lead in the ore which may be imported. There is a duty of 1 cent a pound upon all zinc in the ores which carry as much as 25 per cent. There is a heavy freight rate from New Mexico to the east as far as Kansas City on lead and zinc ores.

Unless the ores are high grade, it is almost impossible to carry them to the reduction works. Smelters have been established at Pueblo, Colo., and El Paso, Tex., to which points nearly all the zinc and lead ores extracted from the mines of New Mexico must be carried. The rates of freight for these hauls are very great. As the zinc and lead must be shipped in ore, the rate of freight necessarily is very high when applied to the amount of actual metal therein. Lead and zinc ores run from 10 to 40 and 50 per cent. Zinc is worth in the market to-day about 5 cents a pound and lead about 4 cents a pound. The freight from the mines in New Mexico to any of the smelters must equal at least 1 cent a pound, or about 20 per cent of the value of lead or zinc. The largest deposits of zinc and lead in the United States, probably, are found at the mines near Joplin, in Missouri and Kansas. They have the advantage of being in large bodies, close to the East, and with good railroad facilities and cheap transportation. They have fully the benefit of 1 cent a pound by way of freight over the New Mexico metals. Yet when the metals of New Mexico get in the market they do not bring to the owner any more than the metals from Joplin, Mo.

The House of Representatives placed a duty in this bill of 10 per cent upon the metal in the zinc ore, to be determined at the port of entry. The Senate committee has increased that amount to 12½ per cent ad valorem, while the duty under the present law was equal to an ad valorem of 46.64 per cent. In 1910 we imported zinc to the value of \$608,476. This was before it was known what policy of the Democratic Party might be installed with the present administration in power. But from the 1st of July, 1912, to the 30th of June, 1913, the importations were only \$77,672 in value of zinc in the ore. These figures show that the people long before the session of this Congress had begun to realize what would happen; that zinc ores would be reduced in value by taking off the duty. No greater supply was imported than was needed. The supply which was on hand was disposed of. The duty on lead of all kinds under the present law when it exceeded 3 per cent is 1½ cents per pound on the lead contained in the ore. The House in this bill put a half a cent per pound on the lead and the Senate increased the same to three-fourths of a cent, just exactly half of the rate that is in effect under the present law.

Under the present law, in 1910, there was imported lead to the value of \$145,426, and in 1912 lead only to the value of \$22,735. The duty under the present law is the equivalent of 55 per cent ad valorem. Under the proposed bill as it passed the House it was equivalent to 20 per cent ad valorem, and as now in the Senate is equivalent to 30 per cent ad valorem, scarcely more than one-half of the duty which exists under the present law. But, again, these figures show that the lead producer and lead dealers are looking to the future and to the present enactment. It shows that there is a falling off in the importations of seven-eighths of the amount. This means that the dealers are laying in no additional stock, but are getting rid of their old supply. They are expecting this bill to reduce the values, and, as a consequence, they desire to get the benefit of the cheaper product. It is estimated that the increase in the importation of the lead ores will reach \$1,600,000 in value, as against the importations amounting to \$582,194 for last year under the present law, or that the importations will be about three times the amount during the present fiscal year they were during the last fiscal year.

This means that we will have to expend \$1,000,000 over and above what we spent during the last fiscal year for lead. This extra amount will have to be paid out of the moneys of our country and sent abroad to remain there, and is an item of evidence as to what the present tariff will do toward keeping up the prosperous times existing under the present law. The current rate of wages of a lead or zinc miner in the State of New Mexico is about \$3. If three-fourths of a cent is taken off the value of lead, it can not compete with any other lead in the United States nor with the lead of any foreign country. There is not that much margin on it. If 34.14 per cent ad valorem is deducted from the duty on zinc in New Mexico; that is, nearly three-fourths of the present duty, we will be unable to compete with zinc in any foreign country. The business must close up. The present troubled condition in the Republic of Mexico makes it practically impossible for any ores to be brought from that country, yet there are zinc and lead reducing plants stationed at El Paso on the border of Mexico for the purpose of receiving the ores of New Mexico, Arizona, and Old Mexico. Zinc and lead ores from Old Mexico, if peace was prevailing there, could be furnished to the El Paso smelters at one-half the cost they could be furnished in New Mexico or other parts of the United States, owing to the cheap labor in Old Mexico, which runs from 12½ cents to \$1 a day for ordinary labor.

One of these plants has been compelled to close up because of two facts: One, the condition of Mexico, and because of this it is impossible for them to get ore enough to supply their plant; another, agitation of the tariff bill which threatens to almost certainly reduce the tariff on ores to such an extent that the New Mexico and Arizona ores can not be handled. There is no certainty that these smelters will resume business. The passage of this bill will close every lead and zinc mine in New Mexico and Arizona, and probably those in Colorado. It is claimed by the majority that lead and zinc are mined by laborers at a wage of about \$1.55 per day. That is the claim made in the letter of the gentleman from Providence, R. I., which was placed in the Record a few days ago by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I have wired to the cashier of the Joplin National Bank, at Joplin, Mo., to obtain the current wages of zinc and lead miners there and have a telegram from him saying:

Answering telegram to-day, wages of miners in this district now run about as follows: Ground men, classified as shovelers, \$2 to \$5 per day, depending on number of cans of dirt filled at rate of 7 to 8 cents per can. Machine men, \$2.75 per day; helpers, \$2.50; trackmen, \$2.75;



tub hookers, \$3 to \$3.50; top men, classified as joiners, \$2.75 to \$3 per day; jig men, \$25 per week; engineers, \$2.75 to \$3 and \$3.50 per day; blacksmiths, \$3; screen men, \$2.25 to \$2.50. These wages about average on present prices of zinc with ore at \$45 to \$50; wages probably 25 cents higher per man per day.

J. E. CARMEN, *Cashier.*

Also I wired to Mr. C. T. Brown, of Socorro, N. Mex., the largest zinc and lead operator in New Mexico, for the current wages there, and have a telegram from his clerk saying:

Mr. Brown out in field; impossible to catch him for several days. We pay timbermen and machine men \$4.50 and \$4; miners, \$4 to \$3; muckers, \$2.75 to \$2 per shift of eight hours.

C. E. MOFFETT, *Clerk.*

These telegrams do not bear out the calculations made by the gentleman in Providence, R. I., which was printed in the Record of July 28, on page 3124. According to the rates shown by the cashier of the bank at Joplin, Mo., if the calculations of the Providence expert were correct, the wage earners at Joplin, who, he says, are about 75 per cent of the whole in the United States, would more than exhaust the whole amount paid for wages and the other one-fourth would get nothing or have to pay something from their pockets to the Joplin wage earner. This shows the criticism of the Senator from Utah on that communication must be correct.

The duty of the present bill may be of benefit to the lead mines in Joplin, Mo., and Kansas, because it will remove from them competitors who now compel them to keep their ores down to a reasonable dividend condition. If they have no competitors, the country at large will be at their mercy, or, at least, at theirs and those who are in the Mississippi Valley, who may combine to make the market as they will. To-day the lead and zinc mines in the Rocky Mountain region keep down the prices of lead. Can it be possible that Senators are legislating in the immediate interest of their own State to the injury of others? It would seem so by the way the duties are being fixed by the Senate on those two products.

Time will demonstrate. There are other products in New Mexico which will be affected by the tariff, among them coal and lumber, of which New Mexico has large quantities. No coal or lumber comes into New Mexico to compete in our individual markets, for the reason that we supply much more than our home market and ship out of the State both lumber and coal. New Mexico supplies most of the coal market of Arizona and southern California and a large portion of northern Texas. By taking the duty off of coal, the markets New Mexico has may be invaded by foreign producers. Australian coal can be brought across as ballast and delivered at San Diego and Los Angeles, without a duty, cheaper than the New Mexico coal. In fact, it can be brought into Arizona and there compete sharply with the New Mexico product. Coal from other countries, especially from Nova Scotia, will be brought into our country on the eastern coast and drive back the supply of coal that is now shipped from the interior to the Atlantic seaboard. The railroads along the line of the Atlantic coast and all sea-going vessels will get their supply from the foreign product. This will necessarily drive the coal in the Allegheny Mountains and in the Mississippi Valley farther west to find a market or close up their mines, or at least curtail their output to such an extent that they will be compelled to discharge large numbers of their employees and throw them upon the world without means of support, as beggars for a living.

In the years 1894, 1895, and 1896 nearly every woolen mill, nearly every spindle in the United States, was standing still; no fires were burning in the furnaces; the chimneys were dead and smokeless; people were without employment, without substantial clothing, and without a sufficient means of support; money could not be had from the banks; business was at a standstill. Would you produce by the passage of this bill a similar condition? I pray that the bill may not pass, and that if it does pass a different condition may result. It has been said that the tariff of 1894 did not produce the panic. The people anticipated the passage of that act. They relied upon the declarations of the party which went into power. The force of those declarations took effect upon them immediately. Upon the result of the election being known times grew hard, money tight, business began to be drawn in, people began to prepare for hard times.

When the Wilson-Gorman bill was passed the panic was practically on. But it was a panic of anticipation, growing out of the declarations of the party in power then; the same party which is in power now. That condition of things continued until the election of McKinley and a Republican Congress, under a declaration that they would inaugurate a tariff for protection and restore the prosperity. Again the people, before McKinley could call the Congress together or take action, discounted the condition of things; prosperity commenced to show itself long before the enactment of the Dingley law; business grew better;

the idler obtained work; credit was extended; money began to circulate; business life sprang up.

When the tariff was lowered by the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman bill times grew hard. When the Wilson-Gorman bill was repealed and the Dingley bill enacted hard times ceased; losses were stopped; prosperity commenced; labor was had; the manufactories started up; money circulated; people were able to obtain better clothing and better food; the world looked better, seemed better, and was better. The act passed by a Republican Congress and approved by a Republican President, providing for \$500,000,000 emergency fund, may save us from the worst features of a panic. Such fund has been placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury with power to use the same for protection against financial distress. He can use it to break down a threatened or impending run upon the banks. He can use it to supply currency which may be needed to meet extraordinary contingencies—such contingencies as may grow and develop out of the disturbances arising from the effects of this bill if enacted into a law. That fund and the experience which the people now have, gained from a knowledge severely earned by experience under the Wilson-Gorman bill and its workings, may save the country from as great disaster as existed in 1894 and 1895. But even all these things can not prevent financial troubles and difficulties. They can not prevent a stringency in the money market and a tightening up and slumping of the business of the country if this bill becomes a law. They can not make it possible to keep a large balance of trade in the face of the proposed enactment. Such will have the effect to minimize business interests in this country, to compel the people having such business to close down or curtail their transactions here and in foreign countries, our dealers to go abroad and purchase in outside markets those things which should be manufactured at home and disposed of here as well as exported.

It can not prevent the expenditures of large volumes of money abroad or in foreign markets which should be kept at home and made to help our own markets. The more you reduce the tariff, the easier you make it possible for the foreign producer to compete more favorably with our manufacturers and producers; the more you will enable him to take from our markets, carry away from our shores the moneys which now circulate among the people; the more you will cause thereby to be imported from abroad and the less you will enable our people to produce so as to send abroad into foreign trade. You will cause less exportation and vastly increase the importation. You will have to more than double the imports in order to get the revenue on such decreased rate of duty. You can not expect that it will be even possible to evade the importation of foreign products into the United States to the extent of double the amount we now import, for which extra amount we will have to send the cash to pay for them. You can not expect when our manufactories and business shall be curtailed or destroyed that we will be able to furnish the same amount of products to ship to foreign countries in order to obtain the amount of moneys which have been flowing for the last 20 years into our treasuries. If you are infatuated with an idea that you can do that, it is well for you to stop and think. If you destroy four and one-half billion pounds of sugar product, which we produce, and compel our people to buy that amount in foreign markets, where does the money come from which is to purchase it? What will fill its place? If you destroy two hundred and fifty millions worth of sheep, or their woolen product, what will take its place, except wool and woolen goods from foreign markets? If you reduce the duty one-half or more on woolen manufactures, if the amount of importation should not be increased, you will lose one-half of the duties now collected. If you place wool on the free list you will lose all the duties on that, amounting to about fourteen millions and a half per year. If you put sugar on the free list you will lose fifty-two millions a year collected as duties thereon.

These are not all the articles on which you are reducing the duty to any great extent. You will lose on them the amount corresponding to the duties now existing and necessarily must increase the amount of importations in order to make up the full complement of income.

You claim that the income tax will make up for the loss on wool and sugar. Possibly it will. The income tax, however, is an experiment. While good financiers may form some approximation as to the amount which will be received thereby, you must wait for its operations. You must see how much the income of individuals will be divided up among families to get the amount of exemption; how much may be applied for the various kinds of losses which they are allowed to charge off; how much the conscience of the individual may be tested and stretched in order to enable him to reduce the amount to be

paid to a minimum. The people in this country are not unlike, in the main, the people of any other civilized country. They all have the same failings, the same human instincts, the same desire to obtain and retain wealth and fortune. You have got to meet these attributes of the man and find how well he can stand the test which this bill, under the income-tax provision, will impose on his conscience.

It seems to me that this bill, in principle, is keeping up the policy heretofore indulged in by Congress and every administration against the West; that is, depriving it of everything possible, for the aid of the East.

Our principal products outside of gold and silver are sugar, coal, lumber, lead, zinc, and cereals, nearly all of which go onto the free list, and those which do not have the duty reduced from two-thirds to three-fourths.

Do you think we in the West can endure privation and poverty more than those in the East? Do you think as a reward for the loss of kindred and friends by the slaughter of the same and the destruction of their means of livelihood by savages we are used to such things and do not need consideration or help? I am not prepared to believe such is the fact.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Shively
Bacon	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Borah	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Hollis	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Hughes	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	James	Page	Smoot
Burton	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Sterling
Catron	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Stone
Chamberlain	Jones	Pittman	Sutherland
Chilton	Kenyon	Poinexter	Swanson
Clapp	Kern	Pomerene	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Reed	Thompson
Crawford	Lane	Saulsbury	Thornton
Cummins	Lea	Shafer	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lewis	Sheppard	Walsh
Fall	Lodge	Sherman	Williams

Mr. BACON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia] has been unavoidably called away from the city this afternoon.

Mr. JAMES. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. BRADLEY], I desire to state that he is unavoidably absent from the city.

Mr. THORNTON. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] is unavoidably absent today.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is necessarily absent today. He is paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be stated, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment, offered by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], is at the top of page 29, as follows: In line 1 strike out "25" and insert in lieu thereof "35," and in line 2 strike out "3" and insert "6," so that, if amended, the paragraph will read:—

101. Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, lava, and all other stone suitable for use as monumental or building stone, except marble, breccia, and onyx, not specially provided for in this section, hewn, dressed, or polished, or otherwise manufactured, 35 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished, 6 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, believing that the rates of duty in the bill as it came from the Committee on Finance would work very great injury to the granite industry of the country, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] offered an amendment restoring the duties of the present law.

That amendment was rejected. I then offered an amendment proposing a reduction of 20 per cent from existing rates, and that amendment was rejected. Laboring under a misapprehension, I moved to strike out the paragraph, and that motion was very properly negatived.

I have now offered an amendment proposing a reduction of 30 per cent from the amount named in the bill for manufactured granite and 40 per cent of unmanufactured granite, and while it may be a vain hope, I have a slight hope that the Senators

on the other side may see the justice of the amendment I have offered and agree to it.

I desire to speak very briefly on the amendment I have proposed and to present some statistics that will, at least, be of historical interest, if they do not materially contribute to the discussion.

In 1909 there were 707 different enterprises engaged in the manufacture of granite in the United States. There were 826 quarries. The capital invested was \$25,422,307. The expenses of operation, and so forth, were \$16,192,138. The wages paid were \$12,181,727. The value of the product was \$18,997,976. The total number of persons engaged was 22,211, and the number of wage earners was 20,561.

Of the entire industry New England had 316 distinct enterprises, being 45 per cent of the whole. She had a capital invested of \$12,842,980, which was about 45 per cent of the whole. She paid wages to the amount of \$6,098,280, being 50 per cent of the whole. The value of her products was \$9,497,135, being 50 per cent of the entire production, and her wage earners were 45 per cent of the entire number. These figures are for the New England States.

New Hampshire has not a very large stake in this matter, and yet it is of very considerable consequence to our little State. She has 40 different enterprises. Forty-six quarries are being operated. The capital invested in 1909 was \$891,030. The expenses of operation were \$1,053,085. The wages paid were \$880,762. The value of her products was \$1,215,461. The number of persons engaged was 1,335, and the number of wage earners engaged, 1,305.

Turning to the Mineral Resources of the United States, 1911, I find these figures as to the value of the granite produced in the United States, and also in the State that I in part represent:

Granite produced in the United States.	
In 1907	\$18,064,708
In 1908	18,420,080
In 1909	19,581,597
In 1910	20,541,967
In 1911	21,391,878

New England produces practically 50 per cent of the entire amount year by year.

Granite produced in New Hampshire.	
In 1907	\$647,721
In 1908	867,028
In 1909	1,215,461
In 1910	1,239,656
In 1911	1,017,272

In addition to these figures I have a statement showing the value of granite, trap rock, sandstone, limestone, and marble used for various purposes in 1910 and 1911, which is of statistical interest, and I shall ask to have it inserted without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Value of granite, trap rock, sandstone, limestone, and marble used for various purposes in 1910 and 1911.

1910.						
Kinds.	Building (rough and dressed).	Monumental (rough and dressed).	Flag-stone.	Curbstone.	Paving stone.	Crushed stone.
Granite.....	\$5,609,313	\$4,716,561	\$44,338	\$1,019,529	\$2,623,772	\$4,208,112
Trap rock.....	87,832				225,645	5,084,908
Sandstone.....	2,778,892		649,079	881,902	899,595	1,406,153
Limestone.....	5,272,024		36,807	165,781	464,837	15,665,302
Marble.....	2,357,795	2,170,981				
Total..	16,105,856	6,887,542	730,224	2,067,212	4,413,849	27,264,535
1911.						
Granite.....	\$6,385,370	\$4,265,773	\$24,640	\$975,104	\$2,787,713	\$4,346,547
Trap rock.....	81,830				197,477	5,877,447
Sandstone.....	2,817,074		749,604	1,124,760	689,826	1,634,074
Limestone.....	4,721,806		27,409	153,893	482,268	16,543,357
Marble.....	2,910,267	2,621,213				
Total..	16,426,341	6,886,986	801,653	2,253,757	4,157,284	28,406,425

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the value of granite represented nearly 28 per cent of the total value of stone in 1911. The increase in value was from \$20,541,967 in 1910 to \$21,391,878 in 1911, an increase of \$849,911. Granite for building and crushed stone increased in value, but there was a decrease in the value of granite for monumental work, curbing, flagging, and paving.

Rough granite for monumental work, granite sold dressed for monumental work, granite for paving blocks, crushed granite



for roads, railroad ballast, and concrete, and granite for miscellaneous purposes not specified in the returns, increased in value; rough granite for building purposes, granite sold dressed for building purposes, and granite sold for rubble, riprap, curbing, and flagging showed a decrease. Fourteen States each produced granite valued at more than \$500,000 in 1911, in the following order: Vermont, Massachusetts, Maine, California, Wisconsin, Washington, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, and Connecticut. Of these States the first seven produced granite valued at more than \$1,000,000 each, and six of them, Vermont, Massachusetts, California, Washington, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, showed an increase in the value of the output.

Now, Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything further at this time on this question. The amendment I offer now proposes a decrease of 30 per cent from the rate fixed in the Senate bill, from 50 per cent on manufactured granite to 35 per cent, and a decrease of 40 per cent on unmanufactured granite, from 10 cents to 6 cents per cubic foot. It is a very large reduction and it is a recognition freely made that, in my judgment, this product can stand a considerable reduction from the terms and rates of the existing law.

The matter is of very considerable interest to some of us. It touches particularly five New England States that have been for a long time engaged in this industry, and that have great pride in the industry, producing as good granite as there is in all the world. Those States are in open and active competition with themselves and in open and active competition with all other States in the American Union that produce granite. They are furnishing the product at a price that does not give them very large profit to-day, and if the bill as it is now proposed shall be enacted into law it may entirely destroy that profit; at least it will very materially affect the industry itself.

I will content myself, Mr. President, now by asking for the yeas and nays on the amendment I have offered, repeating the faint hope that our Democratic friends may see the justice of the amendment and give it a majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are called for by the Senator from New Hampshire on the amendment presented by him.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I shall be obliged to vote against this amendment. My family has been engaged in the stone industry in Massachusetts and New Hampshire for many generations—for over 100 years. It is well known in New Hampshire that my family is so engaged. But I have received no protest or complaint of any sort against the reduction suggested by the bill, except from one manufacturer in the western part of the State.

I have heard this matter discussed for years, and it is not the opinion of the manufacturers of granite or of the owners of granite quarries in New Hampshire that they are materially helped by the present rate. They realize that many duties on articles they consume have been reduced in their interest, and they believe that they should take their share of the reduction.

Granite is so bulky that there is very little of it imported. Now and then some one wants a Scotch granite monument or headstone; and if some widow or widower or daughter wants a Scotch granite headstone instead of a domestic one, there is no reason why that mourner should not have it without paying a large tariff rate.

I know of no demand to have the present tariff rate kept up. There is substantial competition among the different producers of granite all over the country.

It was asked the other day how they could tell the difference between granite that is intended for monumental and building purposes and those stones which are not. I will say that it is so expensive to work a quarry and ship stone that none of our granite is used for building and monumental purposes unless it is what they call good color, and good color and clear stock are very readily recognized. The only poor color and poor stock that is quarried and transported at all is for the purposes of edging and paving. So it is very easy to tell the difference.

For the reasons that I have suggested, Mr. President, I shall vote against the reductions suggested by my colleague.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I had intended to make some observations in reference to the pending amendment, but I think the two New Hampshire Senators have sufficiently debated the question, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply want to say that my State, as well as the State of New Hampshire, is quite a large producer of granite. I believe there are only eight States in the Union that produce more than North Carolina. We produced in 1910 nearly 1,000,000 tons.

Like the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], I have heard of no complaint from my State about this matter, and I do not now recall that we have had any from any source. I am not quite sure about that, however. I have not examined the testimony to see, but I do not recall anyone who has spoken to me about it or anyone who appeared before the subcommittees while I was present.

I rather think, Mr. President, that the apprehension of our friends the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] is without foundation. The Senator from Vermont had great apprehension with reference to competition from Canada. I sent for the book that corresponds to our geological survey of the natural resources of the country, published by the British Government, and I can not find that there is any granite of any consequence produced in Canada except in Quebec. That is where all the granite that need to be feared, I suppose, by New England would come from.

I find that in 1908 there were produced in Quebec only 30,000 cubic yards of granite, and that it was valued at 51,000 pounds. According to the calculation I have made, that is 30 cents a cubic foot, which seems to me very much higher than the price of granite here.

But what I was purposely getting at was some little statistics with reference to competition existing now in New England between the different States where granite is produced. I think the real thing that they need up in New England is some little protection against each other. I have here the Mineral Resources of the United States, giving the production and the price of granite for building purposes and for monumental purposes in the States of Vermont and Maine, and this is what I find:

In 1910 the value of granite for building purposes in Vermont was 57 cents per cubic foot in the rough. In Maine in the same year it was 22 cents per cubic foot in the rough. Dressed in 1910 in Vermont it was \$4.13 per cubic foot. In Maine, when dressed, it was \$2.09 per cubic foot. In Vermont in 1910 and 1911 rough monumental granite was \$1.91 per cubic foot. In Maine in that year, 1911, monumental granite in the rough was worth 67 cents per cubic foot. Granite, monumental, dressed in Vermont that year, was worth \$3.47 per cubic foot. In Maine in that year monumental granite dressed was worth only \$3.03 per cubic foot. So there seems to be a pretty sharp competition between Maine and Vermont in the price of granite, and probably the difference between the price in those two States is very much greater between the price in this country and any other country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single observation.

It is absolutely incomprehensible that for the same quality of granite there can be any such difference in price as between Maine and Vermont. There is granite and granite in our country, and it would be well to compare the qualities before we determine the relative price in the different communities.

Mr. President, I listened with interest to what my colleague [Mr. HOLLIS] said on this subject. It is true that his family at some time, or one or more members of his family, were engaged in the granite business, but I believe they are not engaged in it now. It is a surprise to me that my colleague has not received any communications on this subject from the men who quarry granite and manufacture granite in various towns in New Hampshire. I have received quite a number of communications, one of them coming in my mail this morning, a very earnest appeal that the rates named in the pending bill should be modified to some extent. But I am not going to quarrel with my colleague over that matter. His vote will speak for itself and mine will speak for my position on this and all other subjects.

I had hoped that this concession would be freely granted. Evidently it is not, because the attitude of my colleague, I take it, would settle it if anything was needed to settle it; and I am ready now, as I was 15 minutes ago, to have the yeas and nays taken on the amendment I have offered.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, in reply to what was said by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] as to the question whether there was any cement for the maintenance of the duty upon granite products I beg leave to read briefly from a letter which I have just received from the secretary of the Granite Manufacturers' Association in Barre, which is undoubtedly the largest granite center in the United States. In this letter he says:

It appears that the tariff on granite was reduced at the request of Mr. Frank J. Harold, of Townsend, Townsend & Co., New York City, representing the National Association of Wholesale Granite Dealers, composed of about 15 to 20 firms engaged in selling monuments at wholesale. It is interesting to note that this request for a reduction

In the tariff comes from an organization composed of a few men who get their living by handling what some one else produces. They are not all interested in the production of the goods which they handle, nor do they care what it costs to produce them. They are only interested in the dollars which they can squeeze out of the producer and the consumer; and in case they succeed in getting the tariff reduced, the ultimate consumer will pay just as much for his monument as he does to-day, and what is saved on duty will go to swell the coffers of the wholesaler. It will mean that the wholesaler will push the foreign goods, because he can make a larger margin than he can on the home products. It may be hard for one not familiar with the monument business to understand this particular line of reasoning, but among those who know the business it is a well-known fact that the dealer can sell most any kind of granite which he desires to push. This is specially true of the ordinary sized jobs, as the consumer usually buys but one monument in his lifetime and naturally takes the word of the dealer as to the quality, etc., of the article which he purchases. Working from this premise, it is easily to be understood why the wholesale dealer is so anxious to have the tariff reduced. I understand that no manufacturers were heard at any of the hearings when the schedule was being made up, and it is particularly hard for us to realize that the committee recommended the lowering of the tariff on the strength of the representations made by an organization which is in a way antagonistic to the best interests of the legitimate manufacturer.

If granite were a necessity and the reduction in the tariff would cheapen the ultimate price of the finished monument to the consumer, we would not feel like entering a protest; but the consumer will never know that there has been a reduction, and why throw open the door to foreign granite for the benefit of the importer at the expense of the American manufacturer and the American laborer? The granite cutter in Barre to-day is receiving 40¢ cents per hour, minimum; in Scotland he receives 15 cents per hour average. What protection are you giving the American laborer by this proposed reduction?

I do not care to quote further, but that I think very fairly states the position of the granite manufacturers in Vermont.

My colleague [Mr. PAGE] was not here when the Senator from North Carolina was speaking of the granite industry in Canada. I do not know what information he has upon that subject. I have very little except I know that the Canadian Government places a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on dressed granite, and that duty is so great that no American stock, no New England stock, can enter Canada in a cut or finished condition. All the sales that we can make in Canada of our granite are sales of the product as it comes from the quarry where it has not been improved by the expenditure of money for American labor.

Mr. JAMES. I ask for a vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as bearing upon this question I wish to submit a fact which I ascertained through the Interstate Commerce Commission. I was curious to know whether the freight rate upon granite would afford any protection to the American producer as against the producer of the only sort of monumental granite that is imported into this country.

Upon investigation I found that the freight rate on a short ton of granite from Dundee, Scotland, to New York is \$1.15½; upon a long ton, \$1.25.

A short ton of granite contains from 11.8 to 12.5 cubic feet. I figured out the cubic feet in a monument that was diagrammed and the dimensions given accompanying a letter which I received from a granite-producing firm located at Quincy, Mass., and the only one, I believe, which made any protest before either the Ways and Means Committee or the Finance Committee as to the reduction of these duties, at least so far as I could ascertain from an examination of the testimony.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator will permit me, I think he will find that the association at Barre, whose secretary wrote me the letter I quoted this afternoon, did file their protest.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With the Finance Committee?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. With the Finance Committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Possibly that is so. I could find but one.

Mr. President, figuring the cubical contents of the small monument which was diagrammed in this letter of protest I found it contained about 1 ton of material. Now, taking a ton of granite as having a content of 12 cubic feet and applying the duty to it fixed in the present law of 10 cents per cubic foot the Aldrich duty would be \$1.20; that is, \$1.20 would be the duty on a ton of granite. The freight rate from Scotland to New York is \$1.15. The duty, at 3 cents per cubic foot, would be 36 cents, to which would be added the freight rate of \$1.15, giving the producer in this country, with duty and freight added, a protection amounting to \$1.51 per ton of 2,000 pounds, or, on the basis of a long ton, protection amounting to \$1.61 per ton.

The freight rate from Beebe Junction, Canada, to Chicago and perhaps a dozen distributing points in the United States is almost exactly the same as the freight rate given to the American producer of granite from New York, Baltimore, Barre, Vt., and a number of other points in this country. So there is no protection in the American freight rate as against a foreign producer, but there is a protection in the ocean freight rate.

Now, the question naturally arose in my mind as to whether the shipper of granite from Scotland could not avail himself of a combination rate which would put him more nearly on a competing basis with the American, but the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose assistance I had in ascertaining these rates, inform me that there is no combination rate; that the ocean freight rate would be added to the freight rate in this country on a shipment of granite from Scotland to any interior point in the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin, with his permission—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why a combination freight rate may not be made on this product as well as on other products that we are importing, concerning which great complaint is being made now?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not prepared to give to the Senator any reason based upon the transportation business why such rate might not be granted. I simply state that I am informed that it does not exist at the present time.

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not now; but the added suggestion I would make is that if this violent reduction of duty of 50 per cent should result in a very largely increased importation of Scotch granite, would they not avail themselves of that privilege which seems to be accorded to other importers?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should think they would seek to avail themselves of the lowest rate that they could get. Indeed, it is fair to presume that they have sought and failed to secure such combination rate. There may be, sir, some reason, based upon some rule of transportation with respect to this sort of product, which leads the transportation companies to refuse to give such combination rate. Be that as it may, this rate is the prevailing freight rate now in this country, as I understand it.

Mr. President, as I am on my feet, I will add just one more fact as bearing upon this question, which is rather interesting, and which, I think, must be taken into account in our consideration of tariff reductions.

Great changes have come during the last few years, in a comparatively limited period at least, in the elements affecting cost production in this as in many other businesses. Not long ago the number of men employed in quarries for producing a given quantity of granite was necessarily much larger than now, and I think that we who stand for a reasonable tariff, one that shall be protective of American industries under existing conditions, must give special weight to these changed and changing conditions.

In quarrying granite, Mr. President, the modern drill, which has been put in operation in all of the principal quarries in this country—I think in all of them—enables one man operating that drill, the power for which is furnished by electricity or by compressed air, to drill a hole 3 inches in diameter 8 feet per hour. One man operating that drill can do the work that it required three men to perform in the same time only a few years ago. The wonderful efficiency of this drill enables the sinking of a hole perpendicularly a distance of 25 feet. In one engineering authority I find it stated that in firing a single blast in quarrying granite 70,000 tons of granite were freed and made ready for loading—a sufficient quantity in bulk and weight to load a freight train 3 miles long.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Will the Senator from Wisconsin tell us where that was done?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That was done in the granite quarries of Scotland.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. We never do that in America.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Scotch quarries are equipped, according to this authority, with precisely the same machinery that the Senator will find in the quarries in his State and that are to be found in the granite quarries of Wisconsin.

Of course, that quantity of granite would have to be subdivided, but these modern appliances for blocking this granite are equally improved, and increase the output enormously over the appliances used only a few years ago. Therefore, Mr. President, the difference in the wage scale is not so material a factor in the production of granite as it was a few years ago.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he regards the report of the census as correct? I believe that report says that the percentage of cost of granite is 80 for labor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, I do not believe that statement means the wage cost in a unit of production. I have no doubt that that term as used in the census report refers to the conversion cost. It is inconceivable that it should



be the wage cost. Why, the wage cost in the production of woolen cloth, going through some nine different processes in converting the raw material to the finished product, is, as I recall, from 20 to 45 per cent. It is preposterous to suggest, as it seems to me, that the labor cost of quarrying granite and preparing it for market, drilling and blasting and polishing, which is done largely with labor-saving machinery, is 80 per cent of the total value of the product.

Mr. PAGE. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to interrupt him further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I presume the Senator from Wisconsin is correct in saying that the 80 per cent covers the labor after the blast has thrown out from the side of the quarry the great blocks of granite. I imagine the 80 per cent covers the sawing, which is done largely, though perhaps not altogether, by machinery, and the polishing, which is done by machinery. As the Senator says, the conversion is really pretty much all there is to the work on granite. The work of drilling and getting it out from the side of the mountain is comparatively cheap; but it is true, I think, that the cost of labor which enters into granite—into the finished monument—is about 80 per cent of the entire cost after the granite has been drilled and has been blasted out of the quarry.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am very certain, Mr. President, that the Senator from Vermont is mistaken if he means by the labor cost the wage cost—the sum paid to labor for converting a ton of granite from the raw material as it lies in the ground to the finished product ready for shipment.

Mr. PAGE. I have no means of verifying the figures that are given in the census report. It may be, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, that they include the expense of power.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes; it includes all overhead charges; it includes depreciation; it includes the interest on the investment; it includes everything that goes into the conversion cost.

Mr. PAGE. I do not know that that is a correct statement as to the cost of manufacture. The cost of manufacture, so far as we know, is very largely labor after the granite has been thrown out by the blast.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has now furnished the definition, or, in other words, he has now correctly quoted the census report, which gives us exactly the definition for which I am contending—that is, the total manufacturing cost—that is, the total cost of conversion.

I am not surprised, Mr. President, that there is such a dearth of information before the Senate upon this, as there is upon so many of the other items in this tariff bill. The only firm that responded to the questions that were sent out to those protesting against a change in tariff rates, in so far as shown by the printed report of the committee, is the Granite Manufacturers' Association of Quincy, Mass. It is surprising to read the answers which that association makes, through its secretary, to the questions propounded by the committee, the Finance Committee questions being 29 in number. I will only detain the Senate to merely read the answer to one question.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Would the Senator from Wisconsin tell us the date when those questions were sent out?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The letter of the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. SIMMONS], transmitting these questions, is printed in the document I hold in my hand and is dated May 24, while the answer is dated June 2.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. What is the answer?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator will find it, if he has the document, on page 44.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Did the Senator from Wisconsin state what company had made the answer?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Manufacturers' Association of Quincy, Mass.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator from Wisconsin will look at another document he will see that this company addressed the committee as early as May 13, before the questions were sent out. They wrote to the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is a report which was submitted before that?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But, as I understand it, they were also sent these questions—

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am not disputing with the Senator from Wisconsin about the matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Because I am informed that the committee submitted these questions to every manufacturer or producer in this country who had filed a brief or filed any protest with the committee.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Perhaps I misapprehended the point the Senator from Wisconsin was making. As I understood the

Senator, the point was that these companies did not wake up to the importance of this matter until after they received those questions. As a matter of fact, this company woke up to their importance as soon as they found that these New York firms had appeared asking for the reduction.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was not making that point at all. I will read but one question and answer, Mr. President, from the reply made by the Granite Manufacturers' Association of Quincy, and printed on page 44 of the document. The question submitted referred to the percentage of labor cost to the total cost of a unit of product in this country. That question was presented in one or two different forms, and could not have escaped the attention of anyone to whom it was sent. Anyone will search in vain in the answers made to these questions for any informing answer to those questions. Questions 24 and 25 are as follows:

24. What is the total cost of production per unit of the same products as yours in competing countries? In answering this question give the exact source of your knowledge or information.

25. What is the percentage of labor cost to the total cost of a unit of product in competing countries? In answering this question, give exact source of your knowledge or information, stating the countries separately.

The answer given by the association to which I have referred in response to these two questions combined is this:

Nos. 24 and 25. We can only answer this by stating that the minimum wage for our granite cutters is \$3.25 per day of eight hours, and the wage in Scotland is \$1.35 per day of nine hours. Our information is obtained from members who keep in touch with affairs at their former homes.

It will be observed that they do not state that the wage of \$1.35 in Scotland is for the same class of employment as the minimum wage of \$3.25 which they pay.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it not reasonable to assume that it is?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think that it is reasonable to assume that such an answer is an entirely candid and frank answer to those questions when you take into account not only those two questions but the further questions likewise submitted to them:

What is the total cost of production per unit of product in this country?

What is the total cost of production per unit of product in competing countries?

What is the percentage of the labor cost to the total cost of a unit of product in this country?

What is the percentage of the labor cost to the total cost of a unit of product in competing foreign countries?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, he must remember that those are pretty technical questions to address to a man who is engaged in the granite industry. In my own city we have a great many Englishmen engaged in the granite industry, and they tell us frankly what the difference is between the wages paid in Concord, N. H., and in Scotland, and I apprehend that they mean the same class of work. I never questioned it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would suggest to Senators interested in ascertaining the relative cost of production in this and in competing countries that an examination of the answers to the questions sent out, made by the few who responded at all, fails to furnish very much specific information on the subject. This would indicate that it was a subject that did not trouble them sufficiently to lead them to inform themselves upon it, or else it tends to show a want of the utmost frankness on the part of a very large proportion of those who responded at all.

Mr. President, I believe in an intelligent application of the production-cost theory to tariff making, and I shall have something further to say on that later. I do not believe that it is a magic formula, but I shall contend—and I think can successfully maintain the contention—that without it you have no guide whatever for the making of any sort of a tariff, whether it be a tariff for revenue or a competitive tariff, or a reasonably protective tariff. I believe—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment, if the Senator please, I believe that on a product of this character, with a minimum of the conversion cost being really wage cost or labor cost, we are reasonably safe if we fix duties at a low rate.

We have, in the State of Wisconsin, a considerable production of granite; we have a very extensive field of it of a very fine quality. I have not received—and I had my files consulted only yesterday—any protest from those engaged in that business in Wisconsin. I have been somewhat surprised to find that there is only one—possibly two—protesting manufacturers or producers of granite in all of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. For that reason I shall feel constrained to vote



against the amendment increasing the rate fixed in the pending bill, upon which the roll call has been ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the Senator takes his seat I might say that I voted with great avidity for the questions which the Senator formulated and presented to the Senate; but I thought then, as I think now—and I apprehend the Senator will agree with me—that to reach the difference in labor cost we will have to get some different machinery than simply addressing an individual manufacturer; in other words, we shall have to have a commission who will give their time to it and who will be able to investigate that matter personally, or through agents in foreign countries as well as in this country, which an individual manufacturer can not do.

I can see the great difficulty that those men had, many of them untrained in anything but their own industry, in trying to give categorical answers that would satisfy so technical a mind as that of the Senator from Wisconsin; but I can not believe that they personally made answers to mislead the committee or the Senate.

In reference to this particular matter of the granite industry, I can readily understand, taking the manufacturers in my own town, that those technical questions would stagger them very much. They might sit up two or three nights in endeavoring to formulate an answer that would not at all be acceptable to the Senator or to a committee or to the Senate itself. They might do the very best they could, very much like a man in the country who gets a letter from the Senator may sit up a night or two trying to formulate an answer. He does the best he can, but the letter is not very well expressed when he gets through with it.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit me to reply first to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will then yield to him with pleasure.

Mr. President, I did not offer the questions which were submitted as an amendment to a motion to refer this bill to the Committee on Finance with any suggestion or thought in my mind that the answers to those questions would enable us to dispense with a tariff commission. I believe, sir, in the establishment and maintenance of such a commission, a commission composed of experts, a commission of nonpartisan character; but I do not agree with the Senator that there is any business of very great importance conducted in this country that can not make intelligent answer to every one of the 16 questions which I submitted, in spite of the fact that there were but few responses to the questions sent out, which numbered something like 2,500, if I remember correctly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Over 2,000, I think.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was informed that something over 2,500 were sent out.

Mr. SIMMONS. Probably that is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And the answers, I think, returned, numbered only some sixty-odd.

Mr. SIMMONS. There were 66 answers upon 32 subjects.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, touching the answers made to the particular inquiries addressed to the Massachusetts Granite Manufacturers' Association, I can easily see that it might be difficult for the ordinary man to ascertain precisely the percentage of labor cost per unit of product in foreign factories. He might have some difficulty in that respect; but did this association answer as to the percentage of labor cost per unit of product in this country?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It did not, even as to its own business. I will say to my friend from Indiana that I have little doubt that most concerns of importance in this country will be found to be pretty well informed upon the subject of cost of production. They know to the fraction of a cent the labor cost of production in every unit of their own product. It is not an absolute and continuing thing; it will change with the seasons and from time to time; it will vary; but they know very definitely at the end of the year the cost in every unit of product turned out, and if they have been at all apprehensive of competition from abroad they will be found to be pretty well informed as to the conditions of the principal competing industries in the principal competing countries.

Those that are very large institutions have agents abroad all the while observing, inquiring, investigating, and keeping close watch upon the industries, in order to avail themselves of any improvement that may be made there over the operations in this country, or anything in their systems which in any way can affect the interests here.

Mr. PAGE and Mr. JAMES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator lives in a State where the tanning industry is very large, and I presume he is cognizant of the fact—for I think it is a fact—that the chemicals used in tanning which are brought from Germany are delivered at Milwaukee at a rate of freight not higher than the freight rate from the Atlantic seaboard to Milwaukee. Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was not aware of that particular fact until the Senator stated it; but I do know that combination rates are very common and that the foreign producer is given that advantage over the domestic producer, which in many instances is an element that must be reckoned with.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, has the Senator any doubt in his own mind that if the duties are reduced from 50 per cent to 25 per cent on imported monuments and other manufactures of stone it will materially increase the importations?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not believe it will harmfully increase the importations. I believe the duty will be at about the line which will measure the difference in the cost of production. I am not absolutely certain of that because of the dearth of data; but I purpose in voting for duties to vote with the best light I am able to get on each item, with a view, if I can, of reaching that measure of duty which will cover the difference in the cost of production.

Mr. PAGE. But is it not true, Mr. President, that in making these computations the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate were always keeping in mind the barrier of extra freight, and did not that enter into their consideration very much in deciding on these rates of duty?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am bound to say that where freight rates afford more protection than duties which in themselves are almost prohibitory, they ought to be taken into account. Otherwise, in a combination between the transportation companies and the beneficiaries of high protective duties, the people of this country would be wholly at the mercy of that combination and could be charged double and treble prices.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me, when this question of the duty upon granite was taken up I went to my granite friends in the quarries of my home locality and asked them where they thought the strongest, keenest, most dangerous competition would be found.

I do not think the conditions in the Hardwick and Woodbury quarries are exactly like the conditions in the Barre quarries, because the Barre quarries are very largely producers of monumental granite, while the quarries of Woodbury and Hardwick produce a great deal of building stone.

I want to say that those men were eminently fair. They said to me in 1909: "We are Republicans. The Republicans have promised to reduce duties and we want the granite producers to stand their share of reduction. We do not object to a fair reduction in the tariff; but you ask us what we are apprehensive of, and we simply say that if there ever comes a time when we are not all doing all we can the first trouble will be with the Canadian producer."

As I remarked the other day, the stratum of granite in Vermont extends through into Canada, and there is quite a large concern at Beebe Plains, to which I referred yesterday. I do not know how extensive it is, but I am told it is quite extensive. I want to say to the Senator that Beebe Plains, Hardwick, Woodbury, and Barre are all situated on the Boston & Maine railway system and the freights from all those points are substantially identical. Hence the protection which would be given in the matter of freight to the Hardwick and Woodbury producers, and other producers at that point of the granite-producing section, would not amount to anything, because the rates are the same. I think that fact should be taken into account in considering the duty that ought to be placed upon this commodity.

If it is true that they have at Beebe Plains the same quality of granite, and if it is true that they have a large and well capitalized manufacturing concern, and if it is true—as I am informed, I think, correctly—that the quarry owners there employ nonunion help at \$2.25 per day of nine hours as against a minimum of, I think, \$3.25 paid in this country, the question of labor cost of course comes in. In addition to that, where they work their shops with nonunion men they are able to be more exacting than are the quarries in this country, where the working conditions are prescribed by organizations. I mentioned yesterday the fact that in Canada, where a workman injures a piece of granite, it is charged to his account. That can not be



done on this side. The union men would not suffer it. They think it is not right. The Canadian employers, however, are able to exact that as well as a greater number of hours of work per day.

It is true that, as far as some parts of Vermont are concerned, we make a superior kind of granite. I think the Bethel white, as it is called, has no counterpart in this country. I am told there is something that approaches it, but nothing that equals it. If any of you will take the trouble to look at the new post-office building you will see that it is almost of the whiteness of marble. Those people who produce this high quality of granite are protected by the product itself, so that they have nothing to fear, as there is no foreign granite that is equal to it.

These men have all through the year, and year after year, all the work they can do; and they have not been so solicitous in regard to the tariff as the men who have been confronting different conditions. But the moment you bring the matter to their attention they take their figures and begin to compare what they have to meet in Canada with what they have to meet here; and I believe they are sincere in saying that the labor cost there is very much less than here.

By the way, I want to correct myself in regard to labor cost. The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has kindly informed me that the labor cost is practically 36 per cent. The Senator from Wisconsin was correct in saying that the total cost of conversion or manufacture is 80 per cent.

Another point I want to bring to the attention of the Senate is that in Canada they work extra hours without extra pay. On this side our granite workers are able to exact one and a quarter pay for every hour worked over the eight-hour period. The men go into the quarries at 7 o'clock in the morning and work until 12; then they commence again at 1 and work until 4. You will often see them in our granite producing towns come from work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

I want to say further, Mr. President, that this is an industry of which we ought all to be proud. The men engaged in it are thrifty, intelligent, and, many of them, educated men. They are men who live well and dress respectably, and I believe our friends on the other side of the Chamber who have this particular part of the bill in charge will make a great mistake in reducing the tariff from 10 cents a foot to 3 cents a foot on unmanufactured granite and from 50 to 25 per cent on manufactured granite. I do not believe it is right. I think it is an attack upon a leading Vermont industry more severe than has been made upon any other leading industry in the country.

I want now to revert to what has been given as one of the fundamentals of the new tariff, and that is that there should be competitive conditions and strong competition. I am connected in a business way with these granite men, and I know that there is nothing in this country that is more competitive than the granite business. Aside from one or two large concerns in Hardwick and Woodbury, the whole business is in the hands of little men who have come up from the quarries. They finally find themselves able to hire a little shop; they employ 10 or 20 or 30 men, and then they reach out all over the country for business. I presume there are not only hundreds but perhaps thousands of concerns, nearly all small ones, bidding for business in a way that makes it so thoroughly competitive that they have to be pretty thrifty in order to make any more than a fair daily wage.

I wish the Senator from Missouri could say that in his heart of hearts he does not believe this reduction is right, and change it, although I am frank to say that my faith is hardly up to the scriptural "grain of mustard seed" in regard to the matter, and so believing I will not take up the time of the Senate further in discussing this section of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this is an interesting discussion, and it opens up some new questions. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and then I shall be through.

In answer to a question propounded by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] as to whether the Senator did not believe this reduction would increase importations, the Senator from Wisconsin said that in his judgment it would not to any appreciable extent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not to any very considerable extent.

Mr. GALLINGER. If it does not, what good is it going to do? It is going to reduce the revenue that our Democratic friends are searching for so assiduously and it is not going to affect the business, so what good will the reduction do unless it does to a very considerable extent increase the importations? And if it does largely increase the importations, of course it does that relative amount of injury to the domestic industry and to the men who are engaged in quarrying and manufacturing the granite.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if I was understood to say, or if I said or left the impression upon the Senate, that I did not think it would be felt in importations, I was misunderstood or did not state myself as I should. I am desirous of seeing the duty so framed that unreasonable prices, when charged in this country, will lead to importations. I think the present prices in this country on many of the necessities are unreasonable. I am going into that subject more fully at a later period in the consideration of the bill and shall not take the time of the Senate to do so now.

I am obliged, as every Senator here is obliged, to vote upon these various propositions without complete information. I wish we had more. But I am going to follow the best light I can find, and at any moment during the consideration of the bill when it shall be made reasonably plain to me that I have erred in voting for too low a duty or for too high a duty I shall hasten to correct any error or mistake I may thus make. But for the present I am convinced that the duties fixed in this bill are reasonably protective to the particular industry under consideration, and therefore I shall not vote to increase them above the amounts named in the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire simply to add that unless the reduction in the duties on granite results in increased importations it will be about as idle a piece of legislation as could be conceived of, because it will reduce the revenue on what little is now imported, and it will do no good whatever so far as fixing prices is concerned. I believe it will largely increase the importations from Scotland, from Quebec, and from Nova Scotia. Believing that, I repeat my regret that there is little hope of securing agreement to the very generous reduction that I suggested in my amendment; and I doubly regret that the Senator from Wisconsin can not see his way clear to vote for that amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, right upon that point, I regretted not being able to furnish the Senate some information with respect to the prices of granite of different dimensions for monumental purposes and the variation of those prices covering a period of years. I can only state my impression, but I am very confident, from having been obliged to ascertain as to the prices of monumental work of modest pattern, that notwithstanding the wonderful development in the methods of production that have taken place in recent years the prices of all monumental work have increased very rapidly in the last 10 or 15 or 20 years.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I should like to understand a little better the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator referred to labor-saving machinery that is used in this kind of work at the present time. Does he find that there is any difference between this country and foreign countries in that respect, as far as granite is concerned?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not, Mr. President.

Mr. WORKS. Then I presume that has nothing to do with the question of the rates to be fixed as between the two countries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can not agree at all with that statement of the question. That is, I think the element of protection which the labor of this country has heretofore required is reduced as machinery takes the place of men in production.

Mr. WORKS. Then it is only a question as to the percentage of actual labor used in the production of the article?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Whatever may be the controlling idea with others, with me the difference in the labor cost will be the principal element that will influence my vote in the matter of duties.

Mr. WORKS. Yes; and in this case, according to the Senator, the labor employed is practically the same in foreign countries and in this country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not say anything of the sort. I say that the same kind of machinery is operated in the Scotch quarries that is operated in the granite quarries of this country. The operation of that machinery has brought into employment about the same number of men in the quarries, turning out the same quantity of product; but the number of men has been constantly diminishing with the increase in the use of machinery, so that the wage element or labor cost per unit of production cost is a very much less important matter than when wages constituted so much of the entire cost of production.

Mr. WORKS. The Senator has brought another element into this discussion that is quite important from my point of view, and that is the question of the effect of freight rates. Upon an amendment offered by me a few days ago, based partly upon the larger freight rates which our own people were compelled to pay, it was maintained on the floor of the Senate that freight rates ought not to be considered at all in determining what the

tariff rate should be. Does the Senator agree with that doctrine?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that takes us into quite another subject, and a very important one. I think it would be necessary for us to determine whether that freight rate is a reasonable freight rate. Yet I concede that it is a question of very vital importance to an industry remote from market, and in some cases I might give considerable weight to it. I do not want to see our industries destroyed. In view of the fact, however, that we correct our tariffs at such infrequent periods, I should be reluctant to vote for the continuance of duties which, according to the best information we could get, were at the top notch, because the product is at the present time subject to an excessive freight rate. It seems to me that we must take into account the fact that there is constantly going on in this country important work in the direction of a better regulation of our transportation systems. I am hopeful that within a very few years, when we have acquired all the information necessary and when Congress has become as responsive as I hope to see it ultimately, we may reach a time when we can enforce reasonable transportation charges in this country. I hope that time will come within the next three or four years.

Mr. WORKS. I asked the question because the Senator from Wisconsin proposes in this instance, where the freight rate is against the foreign producer, to use that as a reason for not increasing the tariff.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator does not quote me correctly. I know he does not intend to misquote me. I stated the amount of the freight rate, and stated that it was an additional and excessive protection. I think the rate fixed in the bill, without taking into consideration the freight rate from Scotland to New York, is a protective rate upon rough granite.

Mr. WORKS. I so understood the Senator from Wisconsin. I think I did not misunderstand him. It seems to me it is entirely inconsistent that this rule should not work both ways.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this point?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I think the competition we have to encounter is not from Scotland; it is right across the line in Canada. There is no end of granite there, and in the nature of the case the transportation will cut but a limited figure. Take it over in Ontario; take it in Winnipeg and Owen Sound in Canada. There is enough granite there to answer every purpose in this country right on our borders; and it is that competition rather than the competition of Scotland that we have to fear, if any at all.

Mr. WORKS. I was referring to it more as a matter of principle than anything else, because it is going to be or may be a very important matter in determining the rate that is to be allowed upon other commodities produced in this country. I merely wanted to get at the exact view of the Senator from Wisconsin upon that subject, because, unless he is ready to admit that the difference in freight rates should be taken into account in determining the rate of the tariff where the disadvantage is with us, it seems to me inconsistent to use it as he has done in this instance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, in the light of this debate it might seem that we have exhausted all the phases of the granite question. But I find in the Tariff Handbook a statement which seems to me somewhat curious, and I should like to put a question about it to the chairman of the committee or whoever may be in charge of this particular branch of the bill.

It is recited in the handbook that the importations in 1912 brought a revenue of \$7,499, and that the average unit of value was 41½ cents. The estimate for a 12-month period under the pending bill is for a revenue of \$3,000 a year, and the average unit is estimated at 44 cents. So it would seem, under the reduction which is proposed to be made from 10 cents to 3 cents per cubic foot, that the average unit of value will increase from 41½ cents to 44 cents per foot, and the revenues derived therefrom will be considerably reduced—more than one-half. I wish to ask how those figures were arrived at, and how it was discovered that the reduction in the duty will result in an increase of the average unit of value? Can the Senator from Missouri tell me?

Mr. STONE. I did not understand the Senator, Mr. President. The Senator spoke in such a low tone of voice that it did not reach this side. Do I understand him to ask how it happened that the House has reduced the tariff from 50 to 25 per cent, and has reckoned that the duties collected will be decreased about one-half?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; that was not the question I propounded. The question I asked was how it happens, with a

reduction of the duty upon this article from 10 cents to 3 cents per foot, that that will result in an increase of the price of the article from 41½ cents per foot to 44 cents per foot?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me, I do not know that I am able to tell the Senator offhand the way in which the estimate is made; but it is my impression that in estimating the unit value the expert takes the unit of value for several years, and in that way arrives at the average unit of value. The Senator will see that the unit of value for 1912 is 41.5 cents, as he has stated. For 1910 it was 49.8 cents. It is probable, and I think it is true, that in estimating the unit value here the expert took the three preceding years, and got the average value from that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That would hardly be correct, because in 1905 the value was 35.8 cents.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not mean to say that the expert took 1905; I said "the three preceding years." In this bill there are given the figures for 1912 and 1910, but not the figures for 1911. I think he has taken the three preceding years as being probably the best index of values.

I wish the Senator to understand that I am not stating that with certainty, but I am under that impression. I will try to ascertain how that is, and enlighten the Senator a little bit later; but I think that is the method that has been pursued in making the estimate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The fact still remains that the unit of value in 1912, which consisted of 12 months, being the usual number, was 41.5 per cubic foot.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For the next year it is estimated that it will be lifted to 44 cents per cubic foot as a result of decreasing the duty more than one-half.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will also see that the unit of value for 1910 was 49.8. So if you take those two years, 49.8 for 1910 and 41.5 for 1912, and add them together you would have an average of about 44 cents.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that value per unit is the foreign price. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand that.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is easily explained how it will be advanced. I presume that the committee estimates that the foreign manufacturer, by reason of the reduction of duties and the elimination of American competition, will be enabled to advance the price. It is easy of explanation.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think that ever entered the head of anybody except the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Whatever may be the explanation of it, it seems to me rather absurd for us to reduce a duty upon an article if the result of the reduction is simply going to be to increase the price of the article on which we reduce the duty. I understand the principal object of the bill, as announced by the Democratic majority, is to produce revenue and also to decrease prices. Now, if it has exactly the opposite effect from what its proponents announce and desire, it does not seem to me that there is a great deal of sense in reducing the duty.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator overlooks the fact that if there is a greater importation from abroad it will act as a regulator of prices in this country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I imagine the Senator or whoever was responsible for the estimates must have known what he was about. It is estimated that the quantity will be increased only about one-fourth, namely, from substantially 75,000 to 100,000 cubic feet. That will result in a decrease of duties of considerably more than one-half, namely, from the present amount of \$7,499 to \$3,000 per annum.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is talking about the reduction of the unmanufactured. It is estimated that as a result of that reduction there will be an increase in importations from \$31,000 to \$44,000. Of course we all know, as has been stated here repeatedly and as it was stated in the House, that these estimates are not to be accepted as importing absolute verity. They are simply the result of a calculation. But the Senator will see that of dressed granite the importations last year were \$145,000, and it is estimated that they will be increased to \$200,000 as the result of the reduction.

There may be but little change; there probably would not be much change in the foreign price of the product as a result of our tariff legislation. That is not the question. The question is, What effect will be produced upon the domestic price by an increase of importations? What will be the difference upon the domestic price between a prohibitive duty upon importa-



tions and a duty which is competitive and will allow the foreign product to come in when the domestic product is maintained at too high a level?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that under the estimate of the committee the duty to be received under the bill before us will be \$50,000, as against \$72,905 in 1912. In other words, the bill is not a success as a revenue producer. Its only success, as far as I can see, will be in throwing out of employment some of our Vermont labor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is quite in harmony with the other sections. The policy of it seems to be to decrease the revenue and increase the price of the article.

Mr. PAGE. This matter of the average unit is very unreliable for consideration anyway. It depends very largely on where the granite comes from. There is a great deal of granite in this country, like the "Bethel white," probably worth a dollar a cubic foot. On the other hand, the ordinary cheap gray granite is probably worth in the vicinity of 50 cents a cubic foot. The foreign price as given here is 41.5, against 48.8 in 1910. That difference is very likely because the granite in 1910 came quite largely from Scotland, while the importations in 1912—I do not state it as a fact, but as a probability—were, I presume, more from Canada, where they have a cheaper kind of granite.

Mr. GALLINGER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAMES (when Mr. BRADLEY's name was called). I wish to make the announcement that my colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is unavoidably absent and is paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SHEPPARD (when Mr. CULBERSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and vote "yea."

Mr. THORNTON (when Mr. O'GORMAN's name was called). I wish to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and his pair by transfer with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. BACON (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia] is necessarily absent from the Chamber this afternoon. He is paired with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I observe that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] is not present. I am paired with that Senator and on that account I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], and I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KERN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LEA. I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent on account of sickness in his family and that he is paired with the senior Senator from

Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], and also that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 44, as follows:

## YEAS—19.

Brady	Cummins	Nelson	Sherman
Brandegge	Dillingham	Oliver	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	Page	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Penrose	Works
Clark, Wyo.	McLean	Perkins	

## NAYS—44.

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Smith, Md.
Bacon	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Kenyon	Reed	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kern	Robinson	Stone
Chilton	La Follette	Saulsbury	Swanson
Crawford	Lane	Shafroth	Thompson
Gronna	Lea	Sheppard	Thornton
Hitchcock	Lewis	Shields	Tillman
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Vardaman
Hughes	Myers	Simmons	Walsh
James	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	Williams

## NOT VOTING—33.

Bankhead	du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Fall	Newlands	Stephenson
Bryan	Fletcher	O'Gorman	Thomas
Burleigh	Goff	Owen	Townsend
Cañon	Gore	Pittman	Warren
Clapp	Jackson	Polindexter	Weeks
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Ransdell	
Colt	Lodge	Root	
Culberson	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

So Mr. GALLINGER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I had intended to offer another amendment, which I think I will offer in a modified form. I am a little curious, but will not pursue it to any extent, to understand how it happens that an amendment that I offered fixing a duty of 40 per cent got a good many more votes than a duty fixing 35 per cent, but I presume we are drifting to free trade day by day, and very soon we will be ready to vote to put everything on the free list.

I had intended to offer an amendment fixing the rate at 30 per cent, but I presume I would not get any vote but my own if I should do that. So I shall desist.

But I do want to call attention to one matter in this item that is so palpably unfair that I will risk a viva voce vote in the hope that a few Senators may be willing to raise their voices when they would not record their votes in favor of it.

On unmanufactured granite, Mr. President, the Wilson tariff law—which we allude to sometimes as a free-trade measure—granted a duty of 21.28 per cent. The Dingley tariff law raised it to 35.34 per cent. The Payne law kept it at 20.41. It is proposed now to reduce it to 6.82; in other words, to reduce the tariff from 10 cents to 3 cents per cubic foot on unmanufactured granite.

There may be some reason for it, some occult reason that is not capable of being understood, and probably any attempted explanation would only increase the uncertainty and darkness of the subject. So I am not going to provoke discussion, but I am going to move, Mr. President, that the numeral "3" be stricken out and "5" inserted, reducing the present duty 50 per cent, and I do hope that Senators will in a viva voce vote see the justness and fairness of that proposition and amend the bill to that extent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 29, line 2, before the word "cents," strike out "3" and in lieu thereof insert "5," so that it will read:

Unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished, 5 cents per cubic foot.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STONE. Paragraph 102 was passed over at the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. I would be glad to have it disposed of now.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to know from the Senator who has the schedule in charge why it is necessary to have a duty of \$1.50 a ton on grindstones. I find that a very small quantity is being imported. In 1912 there were only 6,335 tons. From the amount of the importations, the figures would indicate that the tariff is now prohibitive.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the fact is, as stated by the Senator, that, I think, something like \$900,000 of value of this commodity represented the production in this country as against

a very small importation—about one hundred and twenty thousand and odd dollars of importation.

Mr. GRONNA. That is what I say, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from North Dakota is right as to that statement. The duty of \$1.75 carried in the present law was reduced by the other House to \$1.50. Whether that reduction would result in larger importations, and how much greater importations, of course is problematical. The reduction, I will say, manifestly is not very large. Does the Senator from North Dakota desire that the rate shall go still lower?

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to see grindstones on the free list. They are one of the articles used mainly by the farmers. The farmer's wheat and other products are put on the free list, so I do not see why he should be taxed on his grindstone. It is true you have reduced the duty by eighty-eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Mr. STONE. The Senator makes an appeal to me that rather touches me; I will not say it is wholly convincing. However, I do not know but he may be nearer right than wrong. It may be that there ought to be a greater reduction on this article.

Mr. GRONNA. I will wait to hear the Senator from Missouri give some reason why there should be a duty of \$1.50 on grindstones. Under the present law the duty of \$1.75 per ton must be prohibitive, for there have been no importations of any considerable amount.

Mr. STONE. They have not been very large.

Mr. GRONNA. The duty assessed on the farmers I can not figure out from the amount of importations, but the amount the farmer will be taxed upon the quantity imported is insignificant, only about \$7,500; but multiply that by 9, and it amounts to quite a considerable sum. I will let the item go by, because I do not care to delay the passage of this bill; but on lime, which is a product which is mainly used by the farmer—and lime is the poor man's cement—you tax him \$7,500,000 a year. Is that to compensate him for putting his agricultural products on the free list?

Mr. STONE. We will go back to lime in a few moments. I suggest that we might dispose of grindstones at present.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. STONE. What does the Senator from North Dakota wish with reference to it?

Mr. GRONNA. I wish grindstones to be put on the free list. They are a necessity, viewing the matter from the farmers' standpoint. The smallest farm in the country could not get along without a grindstone.

Mr. STONE. It might be well to put grindstones on the free list or to reduce the duty on them; I do not know. If the Senator wishes to have that paragraph passed over, I have no objection, and the committee will consider it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] or the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] kindly inform some of us who are in an inquiring frame of mind this afternoon just what effect this will have upon the American manufacturers? It would be interesting for us to know. Is it desirable that the farmer should get a grindstone at a very cheap rate and put out of business the manufacturers of grindstones in this country?

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what we pretty nearly did for another industry a moment ago.

Mr. GRONNA. I admit, Mr. President, that I voted for it.

Mr. STONE. It is a very small matter one way or the other in the amount involved either in the manufacture or in revenue. If the Senator from North Dakota is insistent upon passing over the paragraph still further, I have no objection.

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to have it passed over; but before I take my seat, Mr. President, I wish to state, in reply to what has just been said by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], that it was simply for the purpose of giving the farmer cheap tombstones that I voted for the paragraph as it is found in the pending bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if I could select the victims I might agree with the Senator from North Dakota. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the paragraph be passed over.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. HUGHES. I presume the Senator from North Dakota is interested in the small grindstones which are usually used upon farms for sharpening agricultural implements. The same situation arises with reference to this item as would arise with reference to many others. I presume the consumption of such grindstones would be affected very slightly by anything that was

done with the rate as proposed to be levied here. The grindstones that are referred to here are very large stones, 20, 30, and 40 feet in diameter. Those are the stones that I understand are largely imported into this country. They are used in file grinding, in saw grinding, and in industries of that kind. It is doubtful upon the particular grindstones in which the Senator from North Dakota is interested if there would be any reduction as a result of placing grindstones generally upon the free list, and we would lose the eleven or twelve thousand dollars of revenue on the large grindstones which are annually imported into this country for file makers and saw makers.

Mr. JAMES. But I will suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that the Senator from North Dakota made, to my mind, a right good Democratic argument. He said that while the amount of revenue collected would be \$11,000, yet the farmers of the country would have to pay nine times that much upon the theory that the production of this country was nine times as much as the importations, and that the manufacturers here add the amount of the tariff to the cost price to the consumer, which strikes me with considerable force.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not want to interject a political discussion.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from North Dakota asks to have the paragraph passed over, and of course we will have it passed.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I am against throwing away this revenue, and I wanted to state my position. A great many of these small grindstones are made out of the large grindstones that are worn down. There is a very large file factory in my State.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from New Jersey does not claim that the importations of grindstones are of small grindstones?

Mr. HUGHES. No; of large grindstones. That is what I say. In the effort to give the farmers these small, insignificant grindstones free we are throwing away the revenue which we should collect on the great big grindstones which are used by the file and saw manufacturers of the country, out of which the little grindstones are finally made when the big ones are worn out. I am opposed to throwing away this \$11,000 worth of revenue, and I wanted to state my position.

Mr. STONE. Well, Mr. President, the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is that the paragraph go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over at the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to take up and see if we can dispose of paragraph 75, relating to lime, which was passed over at the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. He has stated that he has no objection to taking up the paragraph now.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to paragraph 75.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, paragraph 75, line 6, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "lime" and insert "17½ per cent ad valorem, including the value of the barrel or package: *Provided*, That if any adjoining country shall levy and collect duties on importations of lime from the United States under a rate less than 17½ per cent ad valorem the President shall from time to time fix the rate on importations of lime from such country at the rate charged by such country."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not understand just why the rate was fixed in the bill as it is. It could not be for the purpose of raising revenue, because the estimate is that it will produce less revenue than is produced under the existing law. It can not be intended as a protective duty, because it is very materially reduced below the present law. The only effect of it that I can see is to discriminate against our own lime manufacturers in favor of the lime manufacturers of Canada. I am satisfied the committee did not intend any such discrimination; that it was not done purposely; but it seems to me that that will be the inevitable result and the only effect of this reduction.

The tariff under the present law is 5 cents a hundred pounds, including the barrel or package in which the lime is imported. That is the same as the duty imposed by the Wilson law. According to the handbook, reduced to an ad valorem equivalent, the duty under the Wilson law is 28½ per cent; in 1905, under the Dingley law, it was equivalent to an ad valorem of 26.28 per cent; in 1910, under the Payne law, according to the handbook, it was equivalent to an ad valorem of 11.23 per cent; and in 1912 to 9.17 per cent.

I do not understand just how these figures have been obtained. In the handbook the average unit of value in 1896 is given at 17 cents and a fraction a hundred pounds; then in 1905 the unit value is given at 19 cents a hundred pounds. In 1910



the unit value is given at 44 cents and a fraction per hundred pounds, or more than double what it was in 1905; and in 1912 the unit value is given at 54½ cents per hundred pounds, or nearly three times what it was in 1905.

In the statement with reference to the production in this country the handbook gives the total production as 3,467,523 tons, valued at \$13,763,604. If you will figure it out on the basis of a unit of 100 pounds, that will give a little less than 20 cents, or practically the same as the unit value for 1896 and 1905, or one-half of the unit value given here upon which the ad valorem duty is computed.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. So far as unit value is concerned, that is determined by the value of the product per unit as it comes into the customhouse from year to year. That often materially varies from year to year. The variation may be due to one cause or another, according to the product. It may be due, for example, to a cornering of the product by manipulators, or it may be due to shortage of the product in foreign countries and a consequent enhancement of the value there. But the unit value, as the Senator knows, of course, is computed on the value at the place from which the importations come.

Mr. JONES. They would not import lime from a country where it is valued at 44 cents a hundred pounds into a country where they can only get less than 20 cents per hundred pounds for it.

Mr. STONE. I will say to the Senator that for the year 1912, to which the Senator refers, we imported 99,853 units of 100 pounds.

Mr. JONES. Nineteen hundred and ten is really the year to which I am referring now.

Mr. STONE. One hundred pounds is the unit. We imported 99,853 of these units that year, and the value was \$54,459. It is a simple process of division to ascertain the unit value on that year's importations.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; that is true, but it seems to me that the valuation there is wrong. I do not see where they get that valuation, when the value of the production in this country is only 20 cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. STONE. I can not go beyond the appraisements upon which the duties were paid on the importations.

Mr. JONES. I am merely calling attention to the situation with reference to the figures. I do not know, however, that the point is very material with reference to the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. STONE. I will call the attention of the Senator to the further fact that of lime we imported in 1912 \$54,459 in value, and exported \$138,958 worth, or more than twice as much.

Mr. JAMES. Two and a half times as much.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Kentucky says two and a half times as much.

Mr. JONES. I make no question as to that.

Mr. STONE. In addition to that, the uses of lime are numerous. Out of a total production of over \$13,000,000 worth in this country, we imported practically nothing; in other words, wherever we imported \$1 worth we made over \$254 worth.

Mr. JONES. I understand that. I do not think the Senator catches the point to which I was calling attention.

Mr. STONE. Now, \$500,000 worth of this kind of lime was used for fertilizing purposes. It is used for chemical purposes; it is used for building purposes. The uses are very great.

Mr. JONES. Oh, I understand that.

Mr. STONE. I can see no logical reason why this practically prohibitive duty should not be reduced, and I do not think the reduction is greater than it should be.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the point to which I was calling the attention of the committee is that while the unit of value of the imports is given as 44 cents in 1910, according to the other figures the value per unit in this country was only 20 cents, or less than 20 cents, substantially the same as was shown for the other years, from 1896 to 1905 there being a gradual increase. That is, I could not understand why in 1910 the unit of value was more than twice what it was in 1905, when the home value was practically the same as it was in 1905.

I do not know that that is very material with reference to the point I want to make, however, in regard to the duty. It is probably one of the discrepancies in the handbook.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to say to the Senator that I assume there are practically no importations into this country, except probably in that year of high-priced lime. There are a great many of what we might call freak importations. We find

that to be the case all through the bill. There are cases where there are a few importations, and when you begin to investigate the matter it is found that it is some special quality that is not produced in this country, or, at least, not produced in the section of the country where it is imported.

Mr. JONES. That is a new characteristic.

Mr. SIMMONS. As a matter of fact, there is hardly anything that varies so much in price in this country as lime. In my section of the country we produce lime that sells for from \$3.75 to \$4.50 a ton. We buy from other sections of the country a lime for which we pay from \$9 to \$11 a ton. There is a vast difference in the quality of lime, and the domestic price is low. I believe 20 cents is about what the domestic price in 1910 figures out. It is very low, because they took all the limes, those of low quality and those of high quality, and averaged them; and of course the low quality brings down the price of the high quality. I assume that in that year the importations were of the higher grade of lime.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the main point I want to present with reference to this proposition is simply this: The rate on lime going from this country into Canada is 17½ per cent on the lime and on the package. In other words, we can not put our lime into that territory except by paying a duty of 17½ per cent. You are going to permit them to put their lime into this country at only 5 per cent, which can have no other result than to favor the Canadian manufacturer and producer of lime.

I want to discuss this matter also from the standpoint of the peculiar conditions out in our section of the country. We have some lime manufacturing plants in our State, right along the border. There are also large deposits of lime in British Columbia. They have a great deal of Chinese labor over there that is paid about \$1.75 per day, while the labor in this country is paid \$2.87 per day, on an average, for the same kind of work. So they have a decided advantage in that respect.

Then there is a difference in the price of wood, which is largely used in the manufacture of lime. The Canadian purchases his wood for from \$1.40 to \$1.65 a cord.

In this country the manufacturers of lime have to pay from \$2.50 to \$3.25 per cord for their wood. So in that respect they have a decided advantage. Why give them a further advantage by a reduction of the tariff? You will not get any more revenue. According to your own estimates, you will get less than you do under the present rate. According to your own estimate of the ad valorem rate, it is now only nine and seventeen one-hundredths per cent. That certainly is not high—simply a revenue duty. Why reduce it, then, when you do nothing more than simply give the advantage to the Canadian manufacturer?

It seems to me that while this legislation ought to be for the benefit of the American consumer and the American people, it ought not to be framed in such a way—I do not say with the purpose, but in such a way—as actually to discriminate against our own people and in favor of the people of Canada. This matter was argued very strongly the other day by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] with reference to gypsum rock, and I am not going to repeat the arguments he then presented. They apply to this matter even more strongly than they did in that instance.

The amendment I have proposed simply puts us upon an equality with Canada. It simply proposes that we shall put an ad valorem duty of 17½ per cent upon the lime and the package, with a proviso that if any country adjoining ours reduces its rate below 17½ per cent we can reduce our rate to the same figure. It puts us upon an equality so far as the rate is concerned.

In letters that I have from our people they say that all they ask is that we shall place them upon an equality so that they can compete with the Canadian on an equal rate of duty. They do not ask anything else, although labor is higher in this country than it is in Canada, and although wood and material of that kind are higher in this country than in Canada.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. The statement that labor is higher in this country than in Canada is not borne out by the report of the investigating committee, of which Mr. MANN was the chairman, when they were making an investigation on regard to pulp and timber. They reported that in the lumber manufacturing industry the wages were higher, if anything, in Canada than in the United States.

Mr. JONES. Of course, the Senator knows there was a great difference of opinion and also a great difference in the

facts in reference to the different localities. I am not talking about the general condition of labor in Canada. I am talking about the labor in the lime mills bordering on the State of Washington. When I talk about that, I talk about a matter that I know something about. I know that they do employ a great deal of Chinese labor in Canada and that they do not employ Chinese labor in our country, and that the Chinese labor there gets less wages than the American labor in this country.

Mr. JAMES. I suppose the Senator might find certain parts of the United States where they pay a higher wage in one State for the same kind of labor than they pay in another part.

Mr. JONES. Oh, certainly.

Mr. JAMES. I take it that Canada does not differ much from our own country in that respect.

Mr. JONES. But you will find it to be true that wherever Chinese labor is employed it is cheaper than American labor.

Mr. JAMES. What really good reason can the Senator give the Senate for reducing the tariff duty on an article where our exports are two and a half times as great as our imports? In other words, what fear of importations need American manufacturers have when they now export two and a half times as much as is imported here? When the importer has to stand the duty of 5 per cent, which we leave in the bill, what fear of importations need there be when we are now going into his own market and paying the freight rate in order to get there?

Mr. JONES. I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from North Carolina suggested one answer to that question, and that is that the tariff does not at all affect the matter in the interior, but it does affect it along the border line. You might take off the tariff and it would not affect it in North Carolina or in the interior. You might raise it 100 per cent and it would not affect it one way or the other, but it does affect it along the border. That is the condition I have in mind, and that is the condition that I think we ought to try to meet, if it does not injuriously affect the other sections of the country. I would not ask a duty be placed upon an article that my State produces simply for local benefit if it was an injury to all other parts of the country. I would not do that at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator from Washington is saying appeals to me quite strongly, but it seems to me his amendment goes too far. The amendment, as I heard it read, increases the duty to 17½ per cent, does it not?

Mr. JONES. It does.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is only trying to equalize conditions along the border, would he not accomplish that better by leaving the duty as it is, and adding the other part of the amendment? That would make the duty against Canada the same as Canada imposes against us.

Mr. JONES. That is what my amendment does.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator's amendment, as I understand, goes further, and under it lime imported from any other country would have to pay 17½ per cent.

Mr. JONES. No; it says "adjoining countries."

Mr. NORRIS. It applies only to adjoining countries?

Mr. JONES. It applies only to adjoining countries.

Mr. NORRIS. It struck me that the Senator's amendment ought to contain only the reciprocal clause—

Mr. JONES. That is what is intended.

Mr. NORRIS. And let the duty remain as it is in the bill.

Mr. JONES. Of course if the duty is left as it is in the bill, it allows the discrimination to continue. I will say frankly that I have in mind the situation in Canada. They charge us 17½ per cent duty on lime and the package. That is what I put in my amendment, with a proviso that if they reduce their tariff the President is authorized to fix our tariff at the amount they fix. If they put lime on the free list, he is authorized to put it on the free list.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose the Senator's amendment were adopted, and lime were imported from some country that was not an adjoining country?

Mr. JONES. My amendment expressly says "adjoining country."

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator's amendment strikes out "lime."

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. And, as I remember, it strikes out everything after "lime."

Mr. JONES. It does. I suppose that would put lime from other countries into the basket clause, if there is a basket clause. I had not thought about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator think that if his amendment were to be confined to adjoining countries we would come in conflict with the treaties we have with all the other countries of the world?

Mr. JONES. I hardly think so.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think very clearly we would. I want to suggest to the Senator that I rather think there is no reason why this product should not be on the free list, so far as I can see. The truth is, as the Senator states, that it is largely a border proposition. There will be, at some point of the border on our side, the limestone out of which this product is made. There will be no limestone on the other side of the international line. At another point there will be one of these deposits on the other side of the line, and none on our side. I take it that importations from Canada are made only where there is a deposit on the other side that is nearer to a community on this side than any domestic deposit. In that case, lime would be imported into this country. We imported from Canada last year only \$34,000 worth of this material. The balance of the imports came from elsewhere. Only \$34,000 worth came from Canada.

Mr. JONES. That is more than half of the total imports, according to your figures.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; 20 per cent came from Germany. If there is a deposit across the line on the Canadian side near some American community, but there is no American deposit for a considerable distance, it is very much to the advantage of the Americans to buy from the Canadians in that case, on account of the freights. It is well known that this is not only a bulky product, but it is a dangerous product; and the danger of transportation, growing out of the combustibility of the product, adds very much to the freight transportation charge. By reducing the duty, or putting the material on the free list, we save American communities the remission of the duty or the reduction of the duty, as the case may be.

Mr. JONES. I suppose there is not a State in the Union that does not produce lime. I do not know of one, although there may be some particular locality along the border. But you do not provide any way by which we can get into the Canadian locality, where they have no lime.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is hardly a State in the Union where they do not produce lime of some kind; but they do not produce all kinds of lime.

Mr. JONES. I am not splitting hairs on this matter at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the Senator's State the price of lime is somewhere near \$8 a ton. In my State the price is only about \$4 a ton. You produce one quality in your State and we produce another quality in our State. While your State may produce one quality of lime, it may not produce another quality that your people desire and must have. In that event it will be better to buy it from Canada than to have it shipped from some far-distant point in this country.

Mr. JONES. We produce lime in our State at \$2 a ton, so that the figure of \$8 a ton does not apply to us at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the average.

Mr. JONES. I am simply discussing the general condition there. I should like to see some method by which we could put our people, in a general way, on an equality with the people of Canada.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think there is some force in the Senator's claim; but it seems to me it would be better to pass this item now, and make a draft of the amendment which would confine it to the situation described by the Senator, and remove from it any question of its having a general application.

Mr. JONES. I should be perfectly willing to let it go in that way. An amendment was offered the other day using very much this language, and no question of that kind was raised. It had not occurred to me.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me. I think if he will take the amendment which was offered the other day by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] he will find that it does not follow the course that the Senator from Washington is now pursuing. As I remember, however, if he will take the latter part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, and offer it as an amendment at the end of this line of the bill, he will then do all he wants to do, and reach the situation to which I have called the Senator's attention.

Mr. JONES. Would that meet the 17½ per cent duty imposed by Canada?

Mr. NORRIS. It would mean that any country imposing against us a duty greater than that levied in the bill would



meet the same kind of a duty when it came to export lime into this country. I think it would fully meet the situation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Nebraska is in error about that. The amendment that I offered applied only to the duties between adjoining countries. It did provide that Canada could not come in here on any better terms than Canada permitted us to go there. That was the substance of the amendment.

I agree with the Senator from Nebraska, however, that it would be better if there were no attempt to change the duty provided in this bill. If the Senator provides that the duty shall in no event be less than Canada charges us, he will accomplish his entire purpose.

Mr. JONES. Oh, certainly. I can not see how that really makes any difference, however, because the rate is 17½ per cent now. In other words, the provision of the Senator from Iowa would raise the rate.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Iowa tell me on what day he offered his amendment so that I may look it up in the Record?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have forgotten the day, Mr. President. I do not remember.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary has it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the Secretary may read it.

The SECRETARY. The amendment was offered on July 28, and appears in the Record at page 3131, as follows:

*Provided*, That the duties levied and collected upon the commodities covered by this paragraph shall in no event be less than the duties levied and collected by any adjoining country upon the importation of said commodities into such adjoining country from the United States.

Mr. JONES. I think that will cover the situation. The only difference is I propose to put into the bill exactly the rate Canada charges without raising it in an indirect way.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator must see, it seems to me, that putting that rate in as applied to other countries—

Mr. JONES. It applies only to adjoining countries.

Mr. NORRIS. He strikes out of the bill, however, the duty provided; and it would, at least, throw lime into the basket clause.

Mr. JONES. That might be true.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from Washington is satisfied to have his amendment read by the Secretary substituted for the one he has offered, let us have a vote on that.

Mr. JONES. I would be satisfied to have that done, but there is some further argument that I want to present.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is not through?

Mr. JONES. I am not through. I will state that I suppose I would have been through long before this time but for the interruptions. I will ask the Secretary, if he can do so, to fix up the amendment and let it be read as a substitute direct.

Now, here is the situation in our State. The present tariff is used to injure our industry in a way I know no man will approve of and no man will desire to encourage if it can be avoided. I have here a letter from a very responsible man in our State with reference to the competition of the Canadian people in our own market, and I would like the attention of Senators to his statement:

This unequal contest has encouraged British Columbia real estate schemers to open up lime properties in a more or less primitive way, and then, while lying behind their 17½ per cent wall of protection, attack the American markets with the avowed purpose of forcing American manufacturers to either subsidize them to remain out of our markets or to buy them out entirely, in order to maintain a living price for the product from their own kilns in their markets.

Now, notice what the writer of this letter says here:

Just now this exact condition is prevailing. A certain manufacturer on the British Columbia side is continually shipping small quantities of lime into our markets, both to Puget Sound and the Hawaiian Islands, cutting the prices down to an unprofitable basis, and openly and defiantly saying to us "There is just one remedy for you—pay us a sufficient subsidy or buy our plant at our figure as the price of peace in your own markets."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me I would be glad personally to have a vote on this amendment if we could reach it in the near future, but I think it is not probable. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if he thinks we have not put in a pretty good day's work?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think our arrangement was that we should adjourn at 6 o'clock. I wish to say before that is done, however—

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator from North Carolina allow me?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from Washington is about through, I should like to have a vote on his amendment.

Mr. JONES. It would take considerable time, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has an amendment also to offer to this same paragraph. So I suggest that it will probably take 15 or 20 minutes or it may be half an hour.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee whether he would not be willing to have the metal schedule go over until Monday on account of the absence of several Senators.

Mr. BURTON. I thought it was to go over until Tuesday.

Mr. PENROSE. Monday, I think, was the understanding.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am perfectly willing to let it go over until Monday. We have conferred about it. The Senator from Pennsylvania said that he and his colleague and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would be absent to-morrow. They are interested in the metal schedule, and we were perfectly willing, after conferring with the subcommittee, to let it go over until Monday.

Mr. BURTON. I do not wish to insist at all for my personal convenience, but I shall be absent on Monday, and I understood the postponement was to be until Tuesday.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does that mean that the sugar schedule will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. SIMMONS. That would mean that Schedule D would be taken up, and if that was finished we would get, then, to the sugar schedule. D is the wood schedule.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should object to taking up the sugar schedule to-morrow, because—

Mr. PENROSE. The wood schedule could come up. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has indicated his intention of addressing the Senate to-morrow, and we will have a full day, I have no doubt.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suppose if we get through with Schedule D we could go to some other schedule, if the Senator from Kansas was not ready to take up the sugar schedule. I do not know about postponing the metal schedule until Tuesday, unless the Senator from Ohio has some special reason.

Mr. BURTON. I do not really wish to have it postponed to that time unless it is entirely in accordance with the convenience of Members of the Senate. However, it was my understanding that the consideration of that schedule would be postponed until Tuesday morning.

Mr. PENROSE. That was a misunderstanding. My understanding was Monday.

Mr. SIMMONS. The understanding was that it would be postponed until Monday.

Mr. BURTON. I have an amendment to propose to this paragraph relating to lime, and I ask to have it printed in the Record. It was submitted on the 24th of April.

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, and it is as follows:

On page 18, at the end of line 11, change the period at the end of the line to a semicolon and add the words: "*Provided*, That lime shall be subject to a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on lime imported from the United States of 10 per cent or more ad valorem."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was unanimous consent given that the metal schedule should go over until Monday?

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not know that it required unanimous consent. The committee indicated its purpose to let it go over until Monday.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The committee will ask to have it passed over until Monday?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and take up another schedule.

#### PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. SIMMONS. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S 2433) providing for the free importation of articles intended for foreign buildings and exhibits at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and for the protection of foreign exhibitors.

I should like to have unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, because it has been very much delayed. Of course, I will not insist upon it if there is any objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. It proposes to let the articles come in free?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. At the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] I will simply report the bill, and I will ask unanimous consent to take it up to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, August 2, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate August 1, 1913.*

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Harold W. Boynton to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1913.

Ensign William B. Cothran to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1913.

The following-named assistant paymasters with rank of ensign to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 30th day of July, 1913:

George S. Wood,  
Ulrich R. Zivnuska,  
Alonzo G. Hearne,  
Hervey B. Ransdell,  
Harold C. Shaw,  
Henry R. Snyder,  
Smith Hempstone,  
Harry W. Rush, jr.,  
Harold C. Gwynne, and  
Robert W. Clark.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 1913.*

## COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Jack Walker to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas.

## POSTMASTERS.

## FLORIDA.

Thomas C. Fletcher, Lake Butler.  
E. W. Irvine, Lake City.

## ILLINOIS.

W. H. Clear, Mount Pulaski.  
W. G. Cloyd, Bement.  
J. E. Jontry, Chenoa.  
Cleve B. Schroder, Vermont.  
Myrtle E. Smith, Depue.  
Philip H. Sopp, Belleville.  
J. V. Sperry, La Harpe.

## INDIANA.

Charles H. Ball, La Fayette.  
M. E. Maloney, Aurora.  
Michael Scanlon, Boswell.

## KANSAS.

B. W. Hamar, Howard.

## KENTUCKY.

S. F. King, Winchester.

## LOUISIANA.

Lear Mary Hesser, Bonami.

## MAINE.

Joseph E. Brooks, Biddeford.  
Albert F. Donigan, Bingham.  
Arthur L. Newton, Buckfield.

## MISSISSIPPI.

B. F. Lott, Collins.  
John R. Meunier, Biloxi.  
B. Y. Rhodes, West Point.

## NEBRASKA.

John S. Callan, Odell.  
James W. Carson, Edgar.  
Frank C. Cooney, Overton.  
William T. Cropper, Sargent.  
Charles P. Davis, Bladen.  
Joseph J. Heelan, Mullen.  
Isaac T. Merchant, Adams.  
George W. Norris, Beaver Crossing.  
C. F. Smith, Elwood.  
C. R. Tweed, Bassett.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

J. T. Dick, Mebane.

## OHIO.

D. F. Akers, New Carlisle.  
Charles Lee Burns, Andover.  
Jacob Fraker, Sherwood.  
Harry E. Marshall, Bergholz.  
John W. Sanford, Clarington.

## PORTO RICO.

Ramon A. Rivera, Arecibo.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

B. K. Arnold, Woodruff.  
Nevitt Fant, Walhalla.  
Richard W. Scott, Jonesville.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

F. A. Nutter, Alcester.  
Frank Wall, Selby.

## TEXAS.

Allie M. Erwin, Lorraine.  
Cora Dell Fowler, Lockney.  
W. B. Junell, Cumby.  
R. C. Matthews, Palestine.  
Rufus W. Riddels, Electra.  
Carrie E. Smith, Marble Falls.  
N. E. Tucker, Mercedes.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Charles M. Brandon, Follansbee.  
Charles M. Brown, Mount Hope.  
O. C. Dawson, Janelew.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*Friday, August 1, 1913.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Take us, O God our heavenly Father, into the inner sanctuary, the holy of holies, that we may renew our faith and confidence; be strengthened, purified, ennobled by the contact, and lifted above the petty, the sordid self-seeking ambitions, destructive to the larger life and possibilities which wait on the faithful; that we may satisfy the longings of our better self, which makes for righteousness in the soul, and speeds it on to victory under the divine leadership of the Christ. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 29, 1913, was read.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Journal will be approved.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Journal recites that the message of the President was ordered printed, "with the accompanying documents."

The SPEAKER. The words "with the accompanying documents" should be stricken out, because the Chair announced—

Mr. MANN. Was not that the message concerning the Fine Arts Commission report on the Panama Canal?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understood, the Speaker stated that the accompanying documents were sent to the Senate. The Senate ordered the message printed without the accompanying documents. I think myself it would be well, if the House could get hold of the accompanying documents, to have them printed, perhaps. I do not know whether we can get them or not.

The SPEAKER. The Journal will be corrected in that respect, because the Chair announced that there was a note tacked onto the message stating that the documents had been sent to the Senate.

Now, does the gentleman from Illinois ask that the documents be printed?

Mr. MANN. If we have not possession of the documents, I do not know that that would do any good.

The SPEAKER. I suppose that is correct, too, although we are entitled to a copy of the documents if we want them. If there be no objection, the Journal as corrected will stand approved.

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.